

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XIV. JANUARY 1879.

---

ART. I.—IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND  
PROTESTANT?

1. *The Quarterly Review*. No. 292. (London: October, 1878.)
2. *Pastoral Letter to the Diocese of Rochester, from A. W. THOROLD, D.D., Ninety-eighth Bishop*. (London, 1878.)
3. *The Coronation Service, according to the Use of the Church of England*. Edited by JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, B.C.L., F.S.A. (London, 1875.)

THE sophistical trick commonly known as the 'ambiguous middle term' underlies all that stands for reasoning in an article in the *Quarterly Review* for October 1878, entitled 'Is the Church of England Protestant?' The evident intention of the writer is to write the history of the great 'Anglican Church' in convenient oblivion of that historical continuity, in virtue of which, to use the words of the Low Church 'Ninety-eighth Bishop of Rochester,' though Reformed, 'she is Catholic, and dates her birth, not from Henry VIII., but from a pure mother in a far back time.' Contrariwise, with the *Quarterly Reviewer*, Henry VIII. and his New Learning are paraded as if they were all in all, and the legacy from the 'far back time' is contemptuously left matter of precarious favour and concession, revocable at pleasure, and just now more than desirable to be revoked. As a rule, this view, though not without adherents, has been confined, at any rate since the Restoration, to the less cultured members of the Evangelical party, who have been reared in a narrow groove of sectional tradition, and are fully persuaded that any doctrine or usage which happens to be unfamiliar to

VOL. VII.—NO. XIV.

T

themselves must necessarily contradict not only the Bible, but also the Prayer-Book, Articles, and Canons of the Church of England; while their own tenets and practices, on the other hand, are the accredited standard of loyal conformity. Such men are obviously sincere when claiming to be the only faithful members of the Church, for the statement is true in their sense, and its failure to square with the evidence is a circumstance which no more affects them than S. Paul's advice to Timothy to use a little wine for his stomach's sake touched the teetotal fanatic, who, rather than allow that Scripture can be against him, glossed the passage as referring only to external application.

But the *Quarterly Reviewer* exhibits no real sympathy with this school of religious belief, and does not attempt to reinstate it in the position which it occupied even so lately as fifty years ago. Had he so striven, it would be possible to respect the zeal which gave birth to the effort, however undesirable its success might be thought, and unfavourable to that success as all contemporary indications appear to be. Nothing of the sort, however, is to be discovered in his argument, which is of the purely negative and destructive kind, intended to pull down, so far as may be, the dykes built up during the last half century by High Church hands, and to let the salt and barren waters of negation surge back again over the fair regions, now fertile with golden corn, which have been reclaimed from them by the Catholic Revival.

The argument, such as it is, may be tersely, but not unfairly, summarised thus:—

'The High Church school, actively in its most energetic section, and passively at least in its main body, maintains the tenability, within the Church of England, of certain doctrines, technically by thinkers, and invidiously by scoffers, termed Sacerdotalism; while, notably in respect of the Sacraments and the ministry, chief amongst these stand the tenets of Apostolical Succession and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Unless these tenets be the accepted doctrine of the English Church, the whole High Church position breaks down. But these tenets are not Protestant, whereas the Church of England is a Protestant body, and consequently has rejected them, and thereby annihilated the claims of the entire High Church school.'

There is the case, put together with just dexterity enough to satisfy the clients on whose behalf the brief has been drawn up, and with precisely the show of learning sufficient to impress them with admiration for their counsel's erudition.



There is, however, one cardinal omission throughout, which, were it indeed a legal prosecution which was being conducted, would necessarily result in a nonsuit. There is no attempt whatever to define the word *Protestant* itself, which is, of course, the keystone of the whole argument. Nor is this omission an oversight. It has been deliberately adopted in such a way as to mislead the ordinary reader, and to disguise the fact that the word has not merely several different significations in theology and literature generally, but that it is employed in more than one sense in the prosecuting article itself. We will endeavour to make good this omission, as briefly as may be.

There is, first of all, the only strict and exact historical use of the word, whereby it denotes those German princes, nobles, clergy, burghers and others who, on April 29, 1529, lodged their *Protest* against the condemnation of Luther by the Diet of Speyer, and appealed thence to a free General Council. So far as the word can be regarded as a 'trade-mark,' only these persons and their direct representatives by succession or affinity of doctrine have a clear right to its use. That circumstance restricts its most legitimate application to Lutheran Germany, with a possible extension to Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, but in strictness it excludes all other countries and communities. Nor is this a mere technical quibble, for as a fact the word 'Protestant' was used until quite recent times in Germany as distinct from 'Reformed'—a title confined to the Calvinist and Zuinglian societies; while even now it has undergone a further change of meaning, and while 'Evangelical' is the official designation of the new syncretist communion, made up of a fusion of Lutherans and Calvinists, and set up as the State Church in Prussia, the word 'Protestant' is now claimed as peculiarly their own by the propagandists of free thought, insomuch that when the Luther Monument was unveiled at Worms on June 25, 1868, all those of the speakers who explicitly described themselves as 'Protestants' seized the opportunity to assail the fundamental doctrines of Christianity itself. A little later, Professor Bluntschli of Heidelberg, President of the 'Protestanten-Verein,' speaking as an unwelcome guest at the Old Catholic Congress in Cologne on S. Matthew's Day, September 21, 1872, asserted that no agreement in dogma or worship is possible for mankind, not even amongst Protestants themselves, but only in moral and ethical life; and that 'every attempt to formulate the truth is merely relative, and cannot be absolute;' explaining that in making these statements he

was expressing the matured opinions of all German *Protestants*. It is plain, then, that the foreign use of the word is not of much help to the Reviewer's cause, nor will it mend matters if the venue be transferred to Great Britain. Nay, the difficulties rather increase, because of the much wider area over which the use of the disputed term extends. There is Mr. Spurgeon's Protestantism, for example, a perfectly genuine and unimpeachable article of its kind; and there is Mr. Voysey's, equally entitled to the name, but emphatically denying and decrying every specific item of Mr. Spurgeon's creed as sheer blasphemy; while Mr. Bradlaugh, in turn, doubtless views Mr. Voysey as a reactionary conservative. There are the Protestantisms of the *Spectator*, of the *Record*, of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of the *National Reformer*, of the *Standard*, and of the *Daily News*, all radically diverse from each other, but equally justified, so far as any non-Lutherans can be, in claiming to be authentic; while nothing would be easier than to set down the names of a bewildering number of hotly rival and contradictory sects, all bearing the same ticket. Nor does the puzzle end even at this point. In Elizabeth's days, just as 'Protestant' and 'Reformed' were opposed and contrasted on the Continent, so 'Protestant' and 'Puritan' began to be similarly contrasted in England, and this phraseology came into such general usage that not only did Charles I., on certain coins of his, pose as champion of the 'Protestant Religion,' but actually Archbishop Laud—the bugbear to this day of all anti-sacerdotalists—described himself on the scaffold itself as a Protestant, and the word was used within living memory—perhaps is used still—in Ireland by members of the (lately) Established Episcopal Church there, to distinguish themselves not merely from Roman Catholics, but from Presbyterians and other Dissenters. If this last-named *nuance* of the chameleon-like word be what the Reviewer means, he merely answers his question with the question itself.

It is obvious enough, as matter of history, that there has never been any intimate relation of an official character between the Church of England and German Lutheranism. That Luther's powerful genius influenced the Reformation everywhere, even in those forms of it against which he waged ceaseless war, and which did battle against him in their turn, is indisputable; and thus his teaching is, to some small extent, traceable in the Anglican formularies, though far less than Archbishop Laurence imagined, or than the *Quarterly Reviewer* even now allèges. The truth is that the party which

became dominant in the State under the Protector Somerset, and which formed the nucleus of the Puritan school on the return of the Marian exiles, was Zuinglo-Calvinist, and not Lutheran. The broadest and simplest proof of this historical fact lies in the important collection of documents published by the Parker Society, under the title of the *Zürich Letters*. That Zürich was the centre of Zuinglian teaching, as Geneva of Calvinist, and Wittenberg of Lutheran theology, is familiar to all; and that Zürich, then at open war with Wittenberg, should have been a sort of Mecca to the Edwardine and Marian Reformers, establishes at once their lack of sympathy with Lutheranism. Under Elizabeth, the influence of the Scottish Reformers and various other causes induced a development of the Calvinist element, and by the accession of James I. it had contrived to obtain the practical control of the Church of England, albeit it had not even then succeeded in its desired revision of her formularies. The letters of Bullinger, Traheron, and that of Edward VI. himself (doubtless composed for him by Cranmer), on Oct. 20, 1549, of Lady Jane Seymour, his cousin, and others in the Zürich Collection, make the *consensus* between the Reformers, in England and in Zürich, by 1550 at any rate, unquestionable; and it is needless to do more than name Archbishops Whitgift, Grindal, Abbot, and Sandys, Bishops Bullingham, Aylmer, Parkhurst, Horne, and Pilkington, in proof of the influence of Calvinism in high places under Elizabeth and her successor. But one practical conclusion from these facts is, that as the foreign Zuinglians and Calvinists were not usually styled Protestants, and were even at war with the real Protestants of Germany, this title could not have been consistently adopted, and as a fact, was not adopted, by the Church of England at that time. One brief citation from Luther himself will set in a clearer light than any long digression his opinion of Zuinglianism: 'Blessed is the man that hath not stood in the council of the Sacramentarians, and hath not walked in the ways of the Zuinglians, nor sat in the seat of them at Zürich.' There is thus an historical dilemma of this kind before us: If the Church of England was a Protestant Church under the Tudors, it must then, *ex vi termini*, have rejected Calvinism and Zuinglianism; and as it has never, since the accession of the Stuarts, altered its formularies in favour of those opinions, it must be held to reject them still; and thus the Reviewer's argument, so far as it covers those forms of religious belief, falls to the ground. If, contrariwise, the indisputable fact be maintained that Zuinglianism and

Calvinism were powerful factors in the English Church of the sixteenth century, then it had no right to the title Protestant, which at that time excluded those factors, and it has not acquired any subsequent right to assume it in virtue of nearer relations with Lutheranism.

'But,' an irate disputant may remark, 'this is all mere cobweb-spinning, and quibbling about a word, when there is no doubt at all about the thing signified. By "Protestant" is meant all that body of Christian opinion which rejects the authority of the Papal Church, and refuses to accept Roman accretions on the purity of the Gospel; and no intelligent and honest man can deny that such is the avowed attitude of the Church of England.' Very good: we have no objection to argue out the matter on that footing. But a few preliminary questions need to be put to our challenger:—1. Where is the authority for such a definition of Protestantism, and what evidence can you adduce for its authenticity and exactness? 2. How are you justified in extending it so as to take in those whom its original owners, the signatories of the Confession of Augsburg, deliberately excluded? 3. How are you justified, contrariwise, in narrowing it so as to exclude those non-Christians in Germany, Holland, England, and America, who claim it as their title? 4. What do you make of the fact that, if your definition be accepted, it actually covers the whole Greek Church, which has repudiated the Papal claims for a thousand years, which rejects several Roman doctrines, such as those on Purgatory, Indulgences, image-worship, the Immaculate Conception, &c. as corruptions of the Gospel, but which, nevertheless, maintains every one of the specific tenets and practices which the Puritan school desires to make untenable within the Church of England?

For ourselves, we have no theoretical difficulty in accepting—out of deference to common parlance—the word 'Protestant' when narrowed to the one meaning of non-Papal, though we must, *in limine*, say that with the world of designations to choose from, this particular one is not very happily chosen for the expression of the idea: especially when we consider that popular use employs it with equal inappropriateness to signify the negations of Agnosticism, and the system of the Swedish Christian, with Episcopacy for his platform, vestments and 'mass' for his worship, and Consubstantiation for his doctrine. But the practical difficulty about accepting it as an epithet of the Church of England is that those who so apply it mean very often to cover surreptitiously a great deal more ground than the one historical fact of our continuous 'protest'

against Roman error involves ; and even when no such secret design exists, the very indefiniteness of the word, and the exceedingly bad company it has been keeping for a couple of centuries, make its adoption highly inexpedient, to say the very least ; because not only would it be possible to introduce any amount of Rationalism into the Church of England under its shelter, but, as a practical fact, the attempt has been made to do so, and on precisely this very plea, several times within the last twenty years, as any one who pleases may ascertain by examining the documents connected with the Colenso, *Essays and Reviews*, and Voysey cases, while a more insidious effort has been made in the same direction by the abortive Occasional Sermons Bill, introduced with the view of throwing open Anglican pulpits to Nonconformists, free from the restraints of the ecclesiastical laws, and thus able to contradict and deprave with absolute impunity every formulary of the Church of England within her own congregation.

Hence, too, it is that men of keen intellect and robust faith are chary of committing themselves to so elastic and slippery a term. And it may be well to cite in illustration the words of one of the ablest and most philosophical thinkers of whom English literature can boast, and who, both as a layman and as one whose career was ended long before the outbreak of recent controversies, is free from the suspicion of modern theological partisanship :—

‘Our predecessors in legislation were not so irrational (not to say impious) as to form an operose ecclesiastical establishment, and even to render the State in some degree subservient to it, when their religion (if such it might be called) was nothing but a mere *negation* of some other, without any positive idea either of doctrine, discipline, worship or morals, in the scheme which they professed themselves, and which they imposed upon others, even under penalties and incapacities. . . . So little idea had they at the Revolution of establishing Protestantism indefinitely, that they did not indefinitely *tolerate* it under that name. If mere dissent from the Church of Rome be a merit, he that dissents the most perfectly is the most meritorious, for many points we hold strongly with that Church. He that dissents throughout with that Church will dissent from the Church of England, and then it will be a part of his merit that he dissents with ourselves ; a whimsical piece of merit for any set of men to establish. . . . *A man is certainly the most perfect Protestant who protests against the whole Christian religion.* Whether a person’s having no Christian religion be a title to favour, in exclusion to the largest description of Christians who hold all the doctrines of Christianity, though holding along with them some

errors and some superfluities, is rather more than any man, who has not become recreant and apostate from his baptism, will, I believe, choose to affirm. The countenance given from a spirit of controversy to that negative religion may, by degrees, encourage light and unthinking people to a total indifference to everything positive in matters of doctrine; and in the end, of practice too. If continued, it would play the game of that sort of active, proselytising, and persecuting atheism, which is the disgrace and calamity of our time.'

These weighty sentences, applicable word for word in the present day, are part of a letter written from Beaconsfield, on January 3, 1792, to Sir Hercules Langrishe, by Edmund Burke.

Another shrewd thinker of a much more recent date—and he one whose reputation partly depends on his political and literary opposition to Romanism—has delivered himself as follows:—

'It is not with anything like a wish to carp at words that I avow my ignorance of what is meant by the phrase "the Protestant Faith." "Protestant" and "Faith" are terms which do not seem to me to accord together; the object of "Faith" is Divine Truth; the object of "Protestant" is human error. How, therefore, can one be an attribute of the other?'

So wrote a divine who was at one time in honour with the *Quarterly Review*—Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, in his Pastoral Letter of 1851, p. 65.

We need not pursue this branch of the subject any further at present, but will approach the consideration of the evidence tendered in proof of the Reviewer's thesis. We will not follow the same order, because our object is to remove misapprehensions, whereas his course has been to create or revive prejudice and alarm, and the curiously involved order of his various pleas has the effect of confusing untrained readers.

First, then, let us take the foreign policy of Elizabeth and her Ministers, acquiesced in more or less by all her successors, with the single exception of James II., down to the present day; according to which the weight of English influence has been consistently thrown into the Protestant scale in all those European international disputes which had religious controversy as their avowed or secret origin. The fact is so, in the main, but it has absolutely no bearing on the question in hand, which concerns the Church and ecclesiastical polity of England, not the State with its civil and military policy. What is wanted is some proof that formal intercommunion, as distinguished from informal tokens of good will, existed between the Anglican Church and the various Reformed



bodies on the Continent; what is actually tendered is proof of the military support given by Elizabeth, on political grounds, to the insurgents against England's then most formidable enemy, the King of Spain. It was clearly her interest to give him so much to do in his own dominions as would weaken his power for aggression here; and, indeed, the Reviewer's reference to the Armada is a little unhappy, because it reminds all students of history that the Lord High Admiral who commanded the victorious English fleet was Charles Lord Howard of Effingham, a Roman Catholic peer, who, like his co-religionists then in this country, had no mind to accept a foreign despot as his master on any ground of similarity of creed. We have a modern illustration at hand which serves to expose the hollowness of such an argument. Russia has occupied for some thirty years past, in the minds of a powerful section of English publicists and writers, the same position as Spain did three centuries ago, and it has been thought necessary to cripple her power of menacing either the Mediterranean or the Indian interests of England. This feeling led to our offensive and defensive alliance with Turkey five-and-twenty years ago, and has seemed likely to bring on another at any moment for a twelvemonth past. In the Crimean war, England posed as the helper of a Mohammedan Power against a Christian one, and with the undoubted effect of keeping various other Christian populations, eager for liberty, under the Mohammedan yoke. At that date, too, a leading Evangelical nobleman, speaking for his party, lauded the Sultan as a truer friend to the Gospel than the Czar, and gave the impression, by his language, that Islam was, in his mind, superior as a religion to Oriental Christianity. Within the last few months, one of the arguments adduced by the war-zealots in this country, and notably by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, as a reason for siding against Russia, was that if Turkey should be crushed in the struggle, then the toleration accorded (for the purpose of sowing division) by the Porte to the Protestant missionaries who proselytise from native Christianity, but scarcely even pretend to meddle with the Mohammedans, might in all probability be withdrawn by Russia, which would give a monopoly to the Church of Constantinople; and that on this ground no effort should be spared to keep Islam in the ascendent. What is more, no reasonable doubt exists that a large measure of the exaggerated sympathy expressed for Turkey by certain journals was and is due to the fact that she is an anti-Christian Power, and that Russia, whatever the quality of her religion may be,

is at any rate Christian of some sort. Nothing would be easier than to twist all these circumstances into an assertion that the sympathies of England were with Islam as against Christianity, and to translate this assertion into one making the same allegations in respect of the English Church. But what would it be worth when made? No more than an argument based on the alliance of England with a Roman Catholic Power like Austria against the atheistic propaganda of Revolutionary France just after the Terror, or the notorious fact that one of the chief parties to the coalition of the Treaty of Augsburg, whose most notable result was to place William of Orange on the English throne, was Pope Innocent XI., who secretly abetted the Revolution of 1688 as tending to weaken his great enemy, Louis XIV., by transferring one of the most powerful thrones of Europe from a prince who was almost a French vassal to France's most irreconcilable foe. And if we look forward into the future, there is, to say the very least, no impossibility of a coalition between England and the Roman Catholic Powers of France, Austria, and Belgium against the German Empire, the chief Protestant Power in the world, not by way of theological sympathy, but to resist military aggression.

The next argument to be considered is that deduced from the Coronation Oath as administered to Queen Victoria, which is worded as follows in the one relevant clause:—

'Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established within England and Ireland, and the territories thereunto belonging? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of England and Ireland, and to the Churches there committed to their charges, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them?'

This Coronation Service, it is to be noted, is the *only* document or formulary of the Church of England in which the word 'Protestant' is discoverable,—excluded as that word is, with rigid punctiliousness, from Prayer-Book, Articles, Homilies, and Canons, albeit its use as a theological and controversial term dates back twenty years earlier than the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., and one hundred and thirty-three years before the last revision and settlement under Charles II., so that its marked omission cannot be other than deliberate and purposeful. Hence the stress laid on the oath

by our Reviewer, and indeed by every one who casts about for some way to establish the Protestantism of the Church of England. Let us see, however, what must be taken along with the coveted word, if the Coronation Service is to be set up as a standard of appeal, and how far the accompanying matter helps the plea. (1.) The first rubric directs the use of the *ampulla*, with its oil and spoon, for the anointing, thereby retaining certain ornaments of the second year of King Edward VI. other than those allowed by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in the suits *Hebbert v. Purchas* and *Ridsdale v. Clifton*. (2.) The Queen is directed to make 'her humble adoration' before (3) the *Altar*—a word restricted, like 'Protestant,' to this one Anglican formulary, and vehemently disowned by those who make their boast of the favourite adjective. (4.) The word 'Oblation' is used in a sense which emphasises its employment in the Church Militant Prayer, and makes it difficult to regard it as a mere equivalent for the immediately preceding word 'Alms.' (5.) There are certain rubrics which, construed together, demonstrate that the 'north side of the Holy Table' is not the north end, but the northern part of the *west side*. (6.) The Anointing takes place in the form of a Cross, and (7) with oil to which the adjective 'Holy' is conjoined, implying its previous consecration. (8.) The ring is bestowed with the words 'Receive this ring, the ensign of kingly dignity, and of defence of the Catholic Faith'—not of the 'Protestant Religion.' (9.) The sceptre with the Cross is borne processionally at various times in the course of the Office. (10.) When the Queen offered the bread and wine for the Communion, the Archbishop of Canterbury, receiving them at her hands, said the following prayer: 'Bless, O Lord, we beseech Thee, these Thy gifts, and sanctify them unto this holy use, that by them we may be made partakers of the Body and Blood of Thine only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, and fed unto everlasting life,' &c.—words which are stronger in doctrinal purport than the language of the existing Prayer-Book, and are almost virtually identical with the expressions of the Scottish Office, always loudly denounced by English Puritans; to wit, 'Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly-beloved Son, and so that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of the same His most precious Body and Blood.'

So much for what the Office involves. Let us see next what can be extracted from the Oath by way of consolation for all this sacerdotalism and ritualism: No general acceptance of an abstract Protestantism, but only of 'the Protestant Reformed Religion *established by law*,' further qualified in words which the *Quarterly Reviewer* has carefully omitted to quote, as 'the settlement of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof.' On this let us hear Edmund Burke's comment in the same letter to Langrishe already cited:—

'The Oath as effectually prevents the king from doing anything to the prejudice of the Church in favour of sectaries, Jews, Mahometans, or plain avowed infidels, as if he should do the same thing in favour of the Catholics. You will see that it is the same Protestant Church, so described, that the king is to maintain and communicate with, according to the Act of Settlement of the 12th and 13th of William III. The Act of the 5th of Anne, made in prospect of the Union, is entitled "An Act for securing the Church of England as by law established." It meant to guard the Church implicitly *against any other mode of Protestant religion which might creep in by means of the Union*. It proves beyond doubt, that the legislature did not mean to guard the Church in one part only, and to leave it defenceless and exposed upon every other.'

Here, then, comes in another very weighty fact, that although the Sovereign is crowned as monarch of the United Kingdom, of course including Scotland, which has a Presbyterian Establishment of its own, that Establishment is not recognised in the Coronation Oath as a Church, nor does the Sovereign enter into any personal pledge for its defence and maintenance, although there have been six coronations since the Act of Union in 1707, and seven since the legislative overthrow of the Church of Scotland in 1690. This fact has an important bearing on the argument drawn from the mention of the 'Church of Scotland' in the Bidding Prayer of Canon LV. of 1604, when Scotland was Presbyterian. Chancellor Harington proved, more than a quarter of a century ago, that the word 'Scotland' was inserted in 1604 in view of the then impending revival of Episcopacy, but, even apart from that fact, the omission of the word in the Oath now is highly significant.

But even if all these facts were otherwise, only very cold comfort could be got out of the Coronation Oath as implicating and conditioning the Church of England, for this very sufficient reason—that the last 'settlement' of the 'doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church of England' was that made at the Restoration, and confirmed by

Charles II.'s Act of Uniformity. And it is unnecessary to prove at length the admitted fact that this settlement was much *less* Protestant than any which had legally subsisted from 1552 downwards. No formal alteration has since taken place in any authoritative document of the Church. But the present Coronation Oath, with its clause about the 'Protestant Reformed religion,' is of *later* date than the last settlement, having been devised by Parliament in 1689 for the enthronement of William and Mary. Edward VI. and Elizabeth, the two most Protestant Sovereigns, were crowned with the old Sarum rite. The Oath as tendered to James I., Charles I., Charles II., and James II., ran as follows:—

*'Archbishop.*—Sir, will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm to the people of England the laws and customs to them granted by the Kings of England your lawful and religious predecessors; and, namely, the laws, customs, and franchises granted to the Clergy by the glorious King St. Edward your predecessor, according to the laws of God, *the true profession of the Gospel established in this kingdom*, and agreeing to the prerogatives of the kings thereof, and the ancient customs of this realm?

*'King.*—I grant and promise to keep them.'

That is the Church of England's version of the Oath, and we do not see, as the Coronation Service is no part of the Common Prayer-Book, and therefore not within the terms of the Act of Uniformity, what penalty could be inflicted upon any Archbishop of Canterbury for proposing the earlier form of the Oath, instead of the Parliamentary modification of it, to the Sovereign at a Coronation. That, however, is a mere digression, and the really important deductions from the facts adduced are, that only one person in the whole British Empire is required or expected to regard the Established religion as Protestant; that the obligation laid on that one person arises from the terms of a purely civil and political enactment; that the date of this enactment, if brought into the discussion, estops the attempt to convict the Church of England of having been a Protestant body, even in the eyes of lay statesmen, until the very end of the seventeenth century; and, finally, that the 'Protestantism' to which it ties the Sovereign is not that of Exeter Hall, or of the *Rock*, but that of Laud and the Revisers of 1662. If it could be shown that any contemporary change had then taken place in the ecclesiastical sphere, as, for instance, if the abortive revision of the Liturgy in 1689 had succeeded, in that case it would be quite reasonable to associate the new Oath and the new Prayer-Book as two marks of a new de-

parture, and as having finally decided the struggle of a century and a half as to whether the Protestant or the Catholic element was to prevail in the Church of England. Failing any such simultaneous action, all that the present form of the Oath attests is the political feeling of the Parliament which conferred the throne on William of Orange, its deep-seated conviction, due to the unconstitutional proceedings of James II., that some fresh security ought to be exacted from future Sovereigns at their Coronation, but that the Church of England was not, even civilly, described as a Protestant society till 1689, which is too recent a date for the Reviewer's purpose; while, as regards his cognate reference to the Act of Settlement whereby the British crown is limited to the Protestant branch of the Royal family, Burke, again, exposes its fallacy by remarking: 'The king may *inherit* the crown as a Protestant, but he cannot *hold* it, according to law, without being a Protestant *of the Church of England*;' so that we come back by this road to our original question, What is intended or covered by the word 'Protestant' when applied to Anglicanism?

We do not think it likely that it will be found convenient to give a categorical reply to this inquiry, and will therefore turn to some other issues raised, choosing, as before, our own order of quotation.

Let us take, then, the relations of the Church of England to foreign Protestant bodies and to the question of Protestant ordinations, on which the Reviewer professes to rest the main part of his argument, by establishing that Apostolical Succession is not the doctrine and has not been the practice of the Church of England. We will point out, in the first place, a highly disingenuous artifice in his argument.

He cites two passages from our own pages of July 1877 and January 1878, and one from Mr. J. H. Blunt's *Household Theology*, stating that the Church of England does not reordain Roman Catholic clergymen, but does ordain Protestant ministers who desire admission to her service; and attempts to controvert them by these statements, (*a*) that up to 1662 the validity of Protestant orders was continuously recognised and acted on by the authorities of the Church of England, and that ever since 1662 they have been formally recognised by law, in virtue of the section in Charles II.'s Act of Uniformity which immediately follows the clauses requiring Episcopal ordination as a condition for tenure of a benefice or licence to consecrate the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and is worded thus: 'Provided that the penalties in this Act



shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed Churches allowed, or to be allowed, by the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, in England.'

Now, even if the facts as alleged by the Reviewer were true to the fullest extent, it is clear that by his own silence and words he confesses that since 1662 Episcopal ordination has been rigorously exacted from all persons in the Anglican ministry, with one minutely specified class of exceptions. But neither did we, in the two paragraphs he cites, nor did Mr. Blunt, in his cognate statement, say anything whatever as to the doings or opinions current in the Church of England previous to the Settlement of 1662. All these three passages expressly refer to the existing laws and conditions of things in the Church of England as it is *to-day*; and facts being too strong for the Reviewer there, he has stealthily shifted the ground back to the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Of course this would have been quite fair and relevant had he been supporting the affirmative of the question, '*Was the Church of England Protestant at such and such a date?*' But the question he does ask is quite different: '*Is the Church of England Protestant now?*' He might just as reasonably quote an *Almanach de Gotha* of 1850, to prove that there is no such thing as an United Kingdom of Italy in 1879, as endeavour to prove, from irregularities of Anglican practice two centuries and a half ago, irregularities of Anglican doctrine now.

In any case, the Reviewer's statement does not give the whole of the facts regarding Scotland in 1610 and 1662. At the former date, albeit a less exclusive view of Episcopacy, from unwillingness to unchurch the Continental Reformed bodies, prevailed in England than at the latter, yet far more decisive measures followed the restoration of Bishops in Scotland than on the second occasion. For by an ordinance of 1611 no minister was to be admitted—*i.e.* instituted—to any church without trial and imposition of hands by the bishop and two or three ministers, according to a form printed and strictly enjoined, nor were unordained persons any longer suffered to preach (Spottiswoode, *Hist. of Church and State in Scotland*, iii. 210-212; Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 299). But in 1662, owing to the influence of Lauderdale and Crawford, themselves Presbyterians, the Government (whose openly avowed object was entirely political, and not in the least religious), instead of choosing faithful members of the Episcopalian remnant for the new mitres, conferred them on certain Presbyterian ministers who so far conformed, but who had no

great knowledge of, nor zeal for, the ancient laws and customs of the Church. Consequently, only one of the whole number, down to the Revolution, required Presbyterian ministers to be re-ordained; there was no liturgy in use, not even for the Holy Communion, the surplice was not worn, and, save that the Westminster Confession was not any longer imposed, no attempt was made to Catholicise the current doctrinal teaching; that is to say, the Establishment in Scotland from 1662 to 1690 was wholly Protestant *except* in so far as its government was Episcopal; and it is not wonderful that it went down at the Revolution before a more thorough and logical Protestantism. All that is proved hereby is that Episcopacy alone is not enough to insure Catholicity; and if the Reviewer had been attacking the past of the *Scottish* Episcopal Church, these facts would have been perfectly relevant, as they are relevant to show, upon his premisses, that the Church of Scotland is at this moment more Protestant than the Church of England—'which is absurd.' But they do nothing at all towards showing that the Church of *England* was or is Protestant, because the whole action of the Church of England in the matter was to supply the lacking Orders, and then to leave the independent body which received them at liberty to make the best use of the gift, and quite unfettered in its discretion as to its own internal affairs. There was never any such legislative union between the Churches of England and Scotland as that between those of England and Ireland, because while Episcopacy remained established, there was no Parliamentary union between England and Scotland, so that neither had power to compromise or pledge the other, and the Reviewer's statement is therefore as honest as if he were to declare that Free Trade is rejected by Great Britain as an economic doctrine, because the Australian legislatures have recently enacted Protectionist measures. In any case, there is a more reasonable and probable explanation of the policy adopted in Scotland in 1610 and 1662 than that of any indirect recognition of the validity of Presbyterian Ordinations. The simple fact is, that men had to aim at what was practical, not at what was ideal. If Presbyterianism were as good as Episcopacy, there was no motive whatever for restoring bishops; if Episcopacy were to have a chance in Scotland at all, it would have been madness to have rejected all non-Episcopal ministers, especially after the lessons of 1637. All that could be done, obviously, was to ensure Episcopal ordination for all future ministers, and to let those who declined re-ordination die out by degrees. Suppose, for

example, that in our day there were to be a reconciliation of the Methodists to the Church of England attempted, does any one dream that it could really be carried out on the preliminary footing of requiring every Wesleyan minister to confess himself a mere uncommissioned layman? Is it not nearly certain that we should have to tolerate a great part of the existing pastorate, and merely provide that all new ministers should be episcopally ordained, and likewise such old ones as desired to quit their meetings or circuits, and to become settled rectors, vicars, or curates in the Anglican body? But how would the exercise of common sense and patience of this sort disprove the belief of the Church in the doctrine of Apostolical Succession?

Before entering on the main discussion, we will pause for a moment to signalise the bold misinterpretation, which it will be charitable to ascribe to sheer ignorance, which the Reviewer has put on the section cited above from the Act of Uniformity. It is to be remembered that the statute in question, enacted when the now discarded notion was still prevalent, that it is possible for the State to coerce the whole nation to adopt one form of religion, was not merely internal to the Church of England, but was directed externally against Nonconformity, whose public worship it helped to make illegal unless exceptionally tolerated. But there were in England at the time of its enactment certain hereditary congregations of foreign Protestant refugees and their descendants, who had been specially invited and encouraged by former English sovereigns—as others were later, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes—and whose vested rights the statute maintains and protects. Two of these societies exist to the present day—the Dutch one in Austin Friars, and the French one which assembles in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral. But the very fact that they have remained and still do remain separate from the Church of England, as independent communions, shows that their position has all along been that of specially tolerated Dissenters, not of aliens admitted to the full privileges of Church citizenship on equal terms; since, had they been such, there would have been no reason for their separate organisation with churches and ministers of their own, and they would have been absorbed and incorporated long ago (just as they have been in their civil capacity of Englishmen and citizens), instead of remaining, as now, a standing testimony to the sophistry of the *Quarterly Reviewer*, who, as cited above, has endeavoured to represent their civil exemption, as *foreigners*, from the temporal penalties levied against

*English* Nonconformists as equivalent to the ecclesiastical recognition of their position as being canonically valid.

Not less misleading is the Reviewer's reference to the alleged frequency with which persons, having only Protestant and non-episcopal ordination, were admitted to the cure of souls in the Church of England between the accession of Elizabeth and the Restoration. Here he exemplifies the shrewd old maxim of English law, *Dolus versatur in generalibus*. Assuming the facts to be as he alleges—and indeed he might have quoted Clarendon as well as Cosin in proof of his statement that many ministers, with only French or Dutch Presbyterian orders, were admitted to preferment in England—he does not once venture to approach this crucial inquiry: Were these instances, let them be as many as they may, in agreement with the laws of the Church of England, and the most accredited glosses on those laws, or were they violations of the laws, committed on private responsibility, and connived at by authority, and so to be classed with the introduction of Nonconformist ministers and other laymen to discourse in Westminster Abbey, and the invitation of Dr. Vance Smith, a Socinian minister, to the Communion in the same place? What is desiderated is proof that after attention had been drawn to any particular case, and the tenure of a benefice had been challenged on the ground that the incumbent had not been episcopally ordained, the decision of some competent ecclesiastical court or synod had been that the objection was insufficient, and the qualification unnecessary. No question at all exists that throughout the long agony of the Reformation two nations were struggling in the womb of the Church of England, and that it was uncertain, till the settlement of 1662, whether Puritan Esau or Catholic Jacob was to prevail. Esau got the upper hand several times, and notably under such primacies as those of Grindal and Abbot, but even when they were doing their worst, they were always in conscious and direct conflict with the formularies of the Church, to which, in truth, their hostility was always bitter, relentless, and undisguised.

Now, as regards the bare law of the matter, the Church of England never touched any lower point than that of 1552, and in the Ordinal of that year the Preface, like the existing one, begins thus:—

‘It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which offices were evermore held in such reverent estima-

tion, that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereto. And therefore to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, or Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.'

This was the *law* between 1552 and 1662, whatever the *practice* may have been. And the German, French, Swiss, and Dutch Protestants, with whom alone the English clergy had any communication during this period—for there is no trace of intercourse with the quasi-episcopal communions of Sweden and Denmark—had entirely rejected the name, office, and functions of Bishops and Priests, substituting those of Pastors, Ministers, and Elders (the latter being lay officers), and retaining only that of Deacon, but in a sense altogether unlike that of the Anglican Ordinal, being identical with the meaning attached to the office in Presbyterian communities now, where it means little more than 'vestryman,' so that they could not possibly claim admission in the terms of the Ordinal.

In the *Reformatio Legum*, which, though never actually enacted, at any rate expresses the intentions of the extreme Reformers under Edward VI., there are two sections which bear on the question: *De Hæresibus*, cap. 16, in which those are condemned as heretics who allege that persons whose qualifications consist only in knowledge of Scripture, and in a claim to possession of the Spirit, may teach, rule, and administer the Sacraments in the Church without a lawful call or formal imposition of hands; and *De Ecclesiâ*, cap. 12, in which the Bishop alone is named as the bestower of Orders.

*Cranmer's Catechism* of 1548 is even more explicit in its assertion of the doctrine of Apostolical succession, but we do not cite it here, because the date is earlier than that of the temporary predominance of the Zuinglo-Calvinist School, under which alone the recognition of non-episcopal orders is to be looked for.

Now, during the whole period between the Second Book of Edward VI. and the overthrow of the Church of England in 1643 (with the exception of the brief restoration of the Roman polity under Mary I.), there were two causes at work to lower the respect for Episcopacy amongst the English Reformers. First and most accountable stands the fact that Roman Catholic theologians, then and since, in order to exalt

the Papacy, set themselves to depreciate the powers and character of the Episcopate. The deduction is so clear that, if there be a constant historical tradition in the Church Universal of a threefold hierarchy, composed of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with nothing higher than the first of these three Orders, and nothing really clerical in the minor grades below the last of them, then the Pope is only one amongst many hundreds of equals, and merely endowed with a human and ecclesiastical precedence of honour and authority over them, that it has been found necessary to construct a new theory, according to which the three orders are the Pope singly, constituting an entire grade in his own person, Bishops and Priests the second, grouped thus together by the theory that the Episcopate is a mere *extension* of the Presbyterate; and Deacons the third. The pretext of this re-arrangement is very ingeniously made to be, not the depression of Bishops, but the exaltation of Priests, by reason of their equal powers respecting the Holy Eucharist, and thus the true intent of the theory is disguised from all who do not look heedfully to the practical results which have flowed from it, in the gradual subjection of the collective Latin Episcopate to the Pope. As this statement may be new to some of our readers, we subjoin its proof:—

‘Q. An episcopatus est ordo?’

‘R. Episcopatus est verus ordo et verum et propriè dictum Sacramentum, specialem imprimens characterem. Sed cum distinctio ordinum juxta S. Thomam (*Suppl. Quæst. 37, art. 2, in Corp.*) accipienda sit secundum relationem ad Eucharistiam sive consecrandam, sive distribuendam, ideo theologi *episcopatum ordinem distinctum non ponunt, sed eum sub sacerdotio comprehendunt, cum sacerdotes et episcopi quantum ad hoc pari gaudeant potestate*’—(Petri Dens. *Theologia*.—‘Tract. de Ordine,’ N. II. v.)

And as this principle was carried into visible practice by allowing the insignia and privileges of the Episcopate to many Abbots of no more than priestly rank, even so far as to permit them to confer Minor Orders,—not to mention the confusion of Orders arising out of the development of the Cardinalate—it is not strange that the theory of the real equality of bishops and presbyters, when loudly asserted by the foreign Reformers, should have found but feeble opponents here amongst the pupils of Roman theology,—just as the frequent malversation of Church estates by the bishops and abbots of the fifteenth century prepared men’s minds to feel no great shock at the sacrilege and plunder which attended the dissolution of the monasteries.



Next, the whole political as well as the controversial interests of the Reformers were concerned in securing as many allies as possible in the civil and religious conflict to which they were committed. And as a fact no such allies were obtainable except amongst the bodies which had deliberately rejected Episcopacy—though they could easily have retained it, through the means of the various Roman bishops, such as Archbishop Hermann of Cologne and Cardinal Odet de Chatillon, who joined them—and which seemed, in those days, when Protestantism was still in its youth and a great experiment from which glorious results might be hoped, more desirable associates, even on theological grounds, than members of the still unreformed Church of Rome, then teeming with the abuses and scandals of which so many were swept away by the decrees of Trent. It was impossible for any save some exceptionally keen, far-sighted, and philosophical thinkers to have foreseen the ignominious collapse of Protestantism as a religion which our eyes behold now; or to have guessed that, while the Church of Rome, with all its faults, would still hold fast to the creeds of universal Christendom, Protestantism, in its original seats of Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and France, and not less in its later conquests in North America, should, contrariwise, fall away from the very elements of Christian belief, and ally itself with the Great Apostasy, by denying the Son and proceeding to deny the Father. It is not very long since a distinguished English clergyman, making a temporary sojourn in Germany, talked with a German layman on various topics, in the course of which the latter happened to refer to a brother of his, an Evangelical pastor. 'He is,' said the German, 'what you would call in England a High Churchman.' 'What do you mean?' questioned the Englishman. 'Oh, well, for example, he believes in a God.' Nothing but the personal interference of the Emperor William—a man of eighty—as *Summus Episcopus*, prevented the Apostles' Creed from being struck out of the Prussian Liturgy in 1877, by the vote of the Consistories; and only Guizot's influence in 1872 secured a vague assertion of a supernatural element in religion—not, however, including the Deity of Christ—by the narrow majority of sixty-one to forty-six in the French Protestant Synod. There is little prospect of either of these checks being permanent. All this was hidden from the eyes of sixteenth-century Englishmen, though, indeed, in woeful counterpart to the sins of Renaissance Italy, Deism, Atheism, vice and profligacy of all kinds, flourished even then rankly in countries which had opened their arms to the Reformation,

as we know from the sorrowful admissions of the leading Reformers themselves, such as Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Wicelius, and Latimer. And whereas there is much unbelief now prevalent in Roman Catholic countries also, yet there it is a lay revolt from excessive demands made by the clergy on the power of faith; whereas the religious teachers of Protestantism have been and are the heads and leaders in the infidel movement.

However, as we have said, Protestantism was then on its trial, and men were hopeful of its ultimate success, believing its manifest evils to be no more than the accidents of a transitional state, and not permanent and integral factors of its constitution. The wonder, therefore, is not that we find great tenderness of language here as regards the polity of the foreign sects, and occasional connivance at the occupation of English benefices by their ministers, but that no formal recognition of the validity of their Orders, not one valid, open, and authoritative admission of even one of those ministers to cure of souls in this country, so as to commit the Church, is discoverable. On the contrary, in every case where any inquiry was made, the evidence shows that the act was illegally done, and ranked exactly with the connivance of the Puritan bishops at the disuse of the surplice, the Prayer-Book, and many other explicitly binding obligations of English ecclesiastical law. It was much easier to commit irregularities of the sort with impunity in those days than it would be now. There were no newspapers, most of the roads were so bad as to make free intercourse comparatively rare and difficult, save for the small minority who travelled; moreover, the bulk of the people were wholly uneducated, and if a Calvinist bishop or squire chose to confer a benefice on any unordained person, the matter would be practically unknown beyond a very narrow circle, and would pass unnoticed, unless some influential person in that circle thought fit to take it up. There is quite evidence enough to show that such was the case. The leading instance is that of Whittingham, Calvin's brother-in-law, who was made Dean of Durham through Leicester's influence, having received only Genevan ordination. But a suit was actually instituted against him to eject him from the deanery on the ground that he was '*merè laïcus*,' though his death immediately after proceedings had been set on foot prevented the matter from being formally decided. That the feeling against him was very strong will be recognised when it is remembered how difficult it was to contend in that despotism time against persons supported by powerful influence,

whereas Whittingham had not merely Leicester at his back, but Walsingham and Burghley also. His case seems to have guided the ruling of Chief Justice Hobart in the case *Whitgift v. Barrington* in 1623, to the effect that a dean may be a layman, 'as was the Dean of Durham, by special licence and dispensation of the King' (Godolphin, *Repert. Juris*. p. 367),—just as Henry VIII. made Thomas Cromwell, a layman, Dean of Wells—and so, taken at its best, the instance does not help the plea against Anglican teaching on Holy Orders. Besides, there is enough of administrative business and temporal rank attached to a deanery to make it conceivable that this convenient theory might be constructed without thereby touching the case of a parson with cure of souls. The Mastership of the Collegiate Church of S. Katherine's, which has only during the last year been bestowed on a Clerk in Holy Orders, is a precise case in point, since 'Master' or 'Dean' is but a difference of name. Again, if the University Commission were to throw open to laymen those Headships which are now assigned to men in Orders, it would prove nothing one way or the other as to the doctrine of the Church of England on the Apostolical Succession, since no one, not even a *Quarterly Reviewer*, has ever argued that 'Master' or 'Dean' was one of the Holy Orders.

The next fact to cite in this connexion is, that on the question being put to Archbishop Whitgift as to whether there were not sundry non-Episcopalian ministers officiating by permission within his province of Canterbury, his answer was, 'I know none such'—(Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, part iii. p. 182.) Thirdly, there is the case of Travers, who had been ordained by the presbytery at Antwerp in 1576, and sought admission to an English benefice on that qualification. Whitgift's reply to this application, written in 1584, is this: 'Unless he will testify his conformity by subscription . . . and make proof unto me that he is a minister ordered according to the laws of the Church of England, as I verily believe he is not . . . I can by no means yield my consent to placing him . . . in any function of this Church.' There is a fourth case, cited by Lord Macaulay (*Hist. Eng.* chap. i.), with the same object as the Reviewer's, that of depraving the doctrine of the Church of England, namely, Morrison's, a Scotch minister from East Lothian, licensed in 1582 to officiate and minister the Sacraments in England. On this it is to be observed that Morrison was incapable of receiving any such licence, because the Scottish Presbyterians, at the date (1577) of his pretended ordination, did not ordain their ministers at all, but simply

electd them, and constituted them as pastors thereby, without any imposition of hands whatever. It was not till the Second *Book of Discipline* in 1592 that ordination of a sort was introduced amongst them. Consequently Morrison was a mere layman, even according to the *Reformatio Legum*, and Grindal's vicar-general, who granted the licence (as the Primate was suspended at the time), went beyond his powers, and committed an illegality, of which indeed he seems to have been aware, for the dispensation contains this clause—'quatenus jura regni patiuntur'—and there is no question that the laws of the realm did not authorise any such grant, for it was barred, amongst other obstacles, by this then recent and operative clause of the Canons of 1571: 'Episcopus neminem, qui se otioso nomine Lectorem vocet, et manus impositionem non acceperit, in Ecclesiæ ministerio versari patietur.'

The Canons of 1597 prohibit bishops from instituting any one to a benefice unless ordained by themselves, or bringing letters dimissory from some other bishop who has ordained them. And Canon xxxix. of 1603 is worded thus:—

'No bishop shall institute any to a benefice who hath been ordained by any other bishop, except he first show unto him his letters of orders,' &c. Here there is no recognition of any other sort of ordination than episcopal; and Bancroft's sermon at Paul's Cross in 1604 explicitly takes up that as the ground of the Church of England; so that the chain of documentary evidence as to the ecclesiastical laws of England from Edward VI. to James I. is complete and consistent, and not a trace of their 'frankly recognising' non-episcopal orders is discernible, whatever secret connivance may have done on behalf of ministers merely thus qualified. Only one Act of the civil legislature is cited by our Reviewer as making in the other direction, and that is the 13th Elizabeth, cap. 10, which he presents to us in the course of an extract from Keble's preface to Hooker (vol. i. p. lxxvi.), in order to show that the proof is so overwhelming as to have convinced so unwilling a witness as the author of the *Christian Year*, who, however, was not a man of a legal turn of mind. The passage of Keble is as follows:—

'Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Travers's supplication to the Council that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those that had received orders in any other form than that of the English service book, requiring certain securities, to exercise their functions in England.'

Where it is to be noted (*a*) that all that is alleged is not that the Act said so, but that it was a 'construction' put upon it by certain unspecified persons; and (*b*) that Travers appealed to it, and based his claim upon it. But we are not told, and there is no proof adducible, that this construction was ever put or allowed by a competent tribunal, and, as matter of fact, *Travers' 'supplication' was disallowed.*

It would be a very strange thing, considering the relations of Church and State under Elizabeth, if Convocation in 1571, and again in 1597, and the Primate in 1584, had gone directly counter to the provisions of an Act then so recent as 1570. But an examination of the statute itself shows that it is a *disabling*, not an *enabling*, Act, and that its intent was, as Archdeacon Hardwick, to whom the Reviewer appeals as a 'recognised authority of great learning, singular ability, and a trustworthy guide to facts,' points out (*Hist. of Articles*, p. 218), to act as a check on the Anglo-Roman clergy who had been ordained with the rites of the Pontifical revived under Mary I.; for the first clause runs thus:—

'That the Churches of the Queen's Majesty's dominions may be served with fashions of sound religion, be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that every one under the degree of a Bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of the late King of most worthy memory, King Edward the Sixth, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign Lady, before the feast of the Nativity of Christ next following, shall in the presence of the Bishop or Guardian of the Spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion,' &c.

This is a new *disability* imposed on the Marian clergy, in the year, by-the-by, next following the issue of the Bull of Excommunication by Pius V., not an enabling relaxation permitted to non-Episcopalian ministers, or any other persons not previously eligible for preferment; for if it were the latter, it would be necessary that the statute should expressly and in terms repeal the disabling obligation imposed by the Preface to the Ordinal of 1552; while in sections 3 and 4 of the Act the grade of Deacon is prescribed as a minimum for the enjoyment of a benefice of any sort, which was a narrowing of the provisions of the old Canon Law, whereby benefices without cure of souls, such as prebends, might be held by persons in Minor Orders, and indeed were too often held by laymen and even by children. But no Protestant

ministers of that day claimed to be deacons; and, consequently, no reference to them can be intended. It is quite possible that Puritan bishops, on the look-out for modes of evading the law, may have construed the statute otherwise; but there is nothing in its own wording, nor in any formal decision of the matter, to justify them in having so done. And this is the answer to both Cosin and Clarendon. Nothing is more probable, considering the character and policy of Archbishops Abbot, Matthew, and Williams, Bishops Morton, Carleton, Buckeridge, and Davenant, with others under James I. and Charles I., than that they did not strictly require the conditions prescribed by the civil and ecclesiastical laws for the tenure of benefices; but there is absolutely no tittle of proof that in so doing they were doing aught else than violating the law. No doubt a very strong presumption in favour of the legality of their conduct would be shown to exist if the polity and discipline of the Church of England had been sedulously maintained by them in all other respects; but no fact is more thoroughly established than their guilty connivance at the most lawless and aggressive nonconformity on the part of the Puritan faction—nonconformity which would shock even the most advanced Low Churchmen of the present day—so that, for example, in many hundreds of churches the Book of Common Prayer was never used at all, nor the surplice worn, nor kneeling at the Communion practised, and so forth: a state of things which was by no means obsolete even after the Restoration itself, as Hiceringill proves in his *Ceremony-Monger* and *Black Nonconformist*, and as South has taken care to let us know in his vigorous portrait of the conforming Puritan of his day (*False Methods of Church Government Exploded*, Sermon. XXVIII. iii. 2); while the strongest exception which can be cited, the ecclesiastical state of the Channel Islands, is but part of a long story of disgraceful neglect on the part of their diocesans.

Indeed the Reviewer, by not knowing that nothing is more dangerous than proving too much, has spoiled his case here by incautiously alleging that there was no Episcopal minister appointed in Sark till 1820. But upon his own showing, the law has required Episcopal orders as a qualification for preferment ever since 1662, so that either there was no parish of Sark with cure of souls at all till 1820, or the Bishops of Winchester simply failed to do their duty.

Up to 1815, the date of Berry's *History of the Island of Guernsey, &c.*, no English Bishop had ever so much as set foot on the Channel Islands since their political transfer in



Elizabeth's reign from the French diocese of Coutances to the English one of Winchester. Berry says (p. 264) :—

'The Church ceremony of Confirmation, which, by the Canons of England, should be attended to before the admission of persons to the Lord's Supper, *is by necessity omitted in these islands, the Bishop of the diocese never visiting them to perform this religious rite.* But to supply this defect as nearly as possible, private instruction, a competency of age, and the public answering of certain interrogatories at the church, in the presence and hearing of the whole assembly, are considered as a ratification of the baptismal vow, and under such circumstances, all that can be done to qualify the communicant to receive the Holy Sacrament.'

Here, then, is clear proof of the true cause of the irregularity at Sark (assuming it to have existed), for the Reviewer will hardly question that the Church of England does enjoin Confirmation. And the date, 1820, when the defect, by his own admission, was made good, just follows on the first visit of an English Bishop, Fisher of Salisbury, to the Islands in July 1818, so that what the case proves is that the moment attention was really drawn to it the fault was corrected.

But there are some further matters touching the Channel Islands which throw fresh light on the question. At the instigation of Sir Thomas Leighton and Sir Amias Paulet, Governors of Guernsey and Jersey in 1558, Queen Elizabeth permitted them to set up the Genevan discipline in the islands, which, though politically attached to the diocese of Winchester, were thus put practically in communion with the French Huguenots, and were simply left to their own devices in spiritual matters. So they remained till the Restoration, when the local French ministers were all either episcopally re-ordained, or deprived, and it is highly improbable that a rule enforced in Jersey and Guernsey did not extend to Sark. Indeed, the Rev. Nicolas Bernel was transferred from Sark in 1818 to the incumbency of S. Saviour's, Guernsey, which he could not legally have held unless episcopally ordained. What did happen at Sark in 1820 was the completion in that year of a church for divine service, instead of the mere barn previously employed. And, consequently, the Reviewer's alleged fact is not authentic. Any argument based on the state of things between 1558 and 1662 is of just the same value as a reference for a contrary purpose to the ecclesiastical condition of Malta now, which, though politically included in the Anglican diocese of Gibraltar, and the actual residence of its Bishop, nevertheless has an established Roman

Catholic Church and Bishop of its own, fully recognised by the British Government.

And, as the Macedonian woman appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober, so we appeal from Cosin in 1650,—a cowed, dispirited exile, just surviving the total overthrow of the Anglican polity, and finding no such brotherly good-will exhibited to him and his fellows by the Roman clergy in France as their emigrant successors found with us, more than a century later, when they fled to English shelter from the Terror (for the Jesuits had seduced his only son from him, and poached eagerly for converts amongst his scanty congregation in Paris), and so inclined to turn towards foreign Protestants,—to Cosin in 1660, restored to England, powerfully influencing the direction of the last settlement of the Church, and ruling, as Bishop of Durham, for twelve years afterwards, without any action in favour of non-Episcopalian ministers.

No, by that time the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England had learnt through bitter experience what Presbyterianism and Independency, which they had viewed in their French, Dutch, and German forms with too partial eyes, were in their practical working at home, and they took care that no such loophole for the admission of their ministers into places of trust as may have been utilised, however illegally, in the past, should be possible for the future. Accordingly, the clause in the last Act of Uniformity, enforcing Episcopal ordination, is exactly parallel in its object with the new clause in the Coronation oath introduced in 1689. Neither was intended to bring in a new order of things, both were meant to prevent the possibility of evasion and subversion of the laws under colour of a tenable gloss, of which Abbot on the one hand and James II. on the other had been guilty.

There are so many tokens of scanty reading and imperfect knowledge in the *Quarterly Reviewer's* statements, that a large part of his errors may charitably be set down to that cause; but when it comes to sheer misinterpretation of events which are dead against his theory, it is not so easy to excuse him. A palmary example is the way in which he deals with the notorious fact that Archbishop Bramhall of Armagh re-ordained the Presbyterian ministers whom he found holding benefices in his diocese after the Restoration. Bramhall, like a Christian, a gentleman, and a practical man of the world, did this in the least irritating and aggressive way that he could, declaring that he did not enter on the question of the validity of their Orders or of the acts performed in virtue thereof, nor yet on that of the Orders of any foreign Reformed bodies,

but that he merely supplied what was lacking *according to the Canons of the Church of England*, so as to give them the legal status and rights which they did not previously enjoy. This the Reviewer glosses as showing that Bramhall 'emphatically repudiated the assumption that Presbyterian Orders were invalid,' and that it is 'the authority of the State, and not that of the Church of England, which requires Episcopal Orders.'

We will cite, as the Reviewer has done, the strongest clause from the letters of orders which Bramhall granted to one of these re-ordained pastors, to let our readers see what has been carefully distorted into 'emphatic repudiation of invalidity':—

'Non annihilantes priores ordines (*si quos habuit*) nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorum *determinantes*, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forensicarum condemnantes, *quos proprio iudici relinquimus.*' We should have thought that it would have been difficult to choose expressions which, without roughly wounding the susceptibilities of the persons concerned, could have more thoroughly conveyed the Archbishop's conviction of the invalidity of their Orders. And while he appeals to the *civil* law to persuade them for their temporal advantage, it is on the *Canon* law, not on the Act of Uniformity, that he rests his own action, and by which he supplies what they lacked—namely, *everything* which constitutes a valid minister.

So much for the question of home relations to non-Episcopalians. Now let us turn to that of formal intercourse between the Church of England and foreign Protestant bodies.

That no such intercourse exists now, or has existed for two centuries past, despite some coquetting with Lutherans at the accession of George I. (one trace of which survives in the Lutheran Chapel Royal within S. James's Palace) and the fiasco of the Jerusalem Bishopric in our own day, is patent to all inquirers. The Church of England is not Protestant at this moment, if this test be applied. How about the past? Our Reviewer, jerking a sneer at a little book by Mr. Homersham Cox, bearing the same title as his own article, quite fails to refute that gentleman's historical statement that Henry VIII.'s negotiations with foreign Protestants broke down, and that as a fact these negotiations were not practically renewed under Edward VI. or Elizabeth. He gives up all that as hopeless, and tries what he can do with the fact that four English delegates—a bishop, a dean, an archdeacon, and a divinity professor—sat and voted in the Calvinistic Synod of Dort. In truth, this is not merely the *first*, but the *only*, example producible. And let us see

what it comes to after all. To begin with, who commissioned the deputies? To commit the Church of England, it is necessary that they should have been synodically empowered to represent and pledge the Anglican body. But whereas the Synod of Dort met in 1618, no Convocation of either province assembled in England between 1614 and 1621 (Joyce: *England's Sacred Synods*, p. 648), so that there was no proper authority in existence to commission them at setting out, or to receive their report on their return. They went purely as political emissaries of King James I.—a fact which Macaulay, using the event for the same purpose as the Reviewer, indiscreetly discloses by the means he adopts to colour the proceeding more highly, for he says that the deputies were 'commissioned by the head of the English Church.'—(*Hist. Eng.* chap. i.)

Next, what is really needed to make out the case is to show, not that Dutch Protestants admitted English clergymen, whose ministerial character they had no ground for disputing, to vote in their Synod, but that Anglicans allowed Dutch Protestants to sit and vote in Convocation. The 'reciprocity,' so far, 'is all on one side,' and that the wrong one for the Reviewer's purpose. The argument, in short, is much as if the Reviewer, endeavouring to prove that no marked social distinctions exist in England, were to cite the presence and share of some ladies and gentlemen of rank at a servants' dance, in proof of the thesis that footmen and housemaids are eligible as guests at a Court ball.

Thirdly, if the English deputies had been there in any true official capacity, they must have discharged a function cognate to that of plenipotentiaries at an international congress, must have exchanged ratifications, and their signatures, like those to a treaty, must have pledged their senders, unless their action were subsequently repudiated at home. But the decrees of the Synod of Dort have never even been suggested or thought to have been received in this country as of authority, and therefore the action of the deputies, whatever it may have effected in Holland, was wholly inoperative so far as England was concerned.

And lastly, the most eminent Englishman there, Joseph Hall, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, became wiser in later life, and published in 1640 his *Episcopacie by Divine Right Asserted*. Accordingly the presence of Hall, Carleton, Davenant, and Ward at Dort in 1618 proves as much as and no more than the presence and voting of Bishops Harold Browne and Wordsworth, Dean Stanley, Lord Charles Hervey, and

several other English ecclesiastics, in the Old Catholic Congress at Cologne in 1872 ; whereas there is definite synodical action in the refusal of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1689 to permit the phrases 'Protestant Religion' and 'Protestant Church' to be applied to the Church of England in a formal address from the clergy to King William III., and that on the express grounds that Socinians, Anabaptists, and Quakers styled themselves Protestant Churches, and also that the Church of England would 'suffer diminution in being joined with foreign Protestant Churches.'—(Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, p. 331.)

It is worth while, in closing this part of the argument, to refute a cavil which may be raised on the ground that the Church of England, while practically securing Apostolical succession, nowhere declares its absolute necessity. The fact is, that only the Oriental Church does make such an express declaration, and that in the Confession of Dositheus, adopted by the Council of Bethlehem in 1672 ; for even the Tridentine decrees come short of this, and are not so worded as to clearly exclude the other hypothesis, since their most stringent clauses merely condemn those who say 'that bishops are not superior to priests, that they have not the power of confirming or ordaining, or that the power which they possess is common to them and to priests.' But it is nowhere asserted in the decrees that this power might not be communicated to priests by ecclesiastical arrangement, and, as a fact, a simple priest may, by Papal dispensation, act as the minister of confirmation.—(Dens : *Theologia*. 'Tract. de Confirmatione,' vii. 2.)

Having established so far the Catholic polity of the Church of England, and shown that her theory has always been the same, even when her practice, owing to the unfaithfulness of her prelates, was most lax, we will now turn to the doctrinal question raised by the *Quarterly Reviewer*, which he has most conveniently narrowed to the single issue of 'the Sacrifice of the Mass,' 'around which,' he alleges, 'the final struggle of the Reformation centred.'

We may fitly preface its discussion by a few words on the manner in which he has been good enough to refer to ourselves, because it serves as a pattern of the controversial method of his school, from which its moral honesty can be readily gauged. He has carefully selected a number of passages, spread over several of our articles, sedulously disjoined from their context, and so emptied of half their meaning, on which he bases a charge of Romanising tendencies against us, while passing over in entire silence all those articles

wholly or partially devoted by us to the refutation of the Roman system and claims, so as to leave those of his readers who are not also ours under the impression that nothing of the kind has appeared in our pages. And there is an indiscreet admission at the beginning of his paper, that his motive for writing it at all was that the havoc effected by the recent judgment of the Lord Chief Justice of England in Mr. Macdonochie's case has made the general public suspect, what all experts know, and what his scathing reply to Lord Penzance and the Chief Baron's recent letter to Earl Cairns have further confirmed, that the findings of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in all the recent ecclesiastical causes are of too flimsy material to last much longer, so that unless a new and effective cry can be got up to exasperate the ignorant against the High Church school, the machinations of its enemies are likely to fail.

The particular sentences of our penning which seem to have chiefly excited his wrath, are those in which we stated that the religion of the Breviary and Missal, as distinguished from popular Romanism, 'does not vary very essentially from that of the Book of Common Prayer,' and that it is 'comparatively pure.' We have reason to doubt his possession of the information necessary to express any opinion on the subject, because he says in one place: 'The Roman Catholic service-book is a Missal. The Mass in it is everything. In the English Common Prayer-Book the service for the administration of the Holy Communion occupies no such prominence.' Now this is exactly as if an illiterate Dissenter were to take up one of those portable altar-books issued for the use of officiating ministers by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, containing only the Communion Office, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, and were to describe it as the whole of the Common Prayer. The truth is, that the Missal is only one, and not the largest, out of several volumes, which in their totality make up the Roman Catholic service-book, equivalent to our Prayer-Book, namely the Breviary, Missal, Ritual, Pontifical, Processional, and some minor and merely occasional ones not needful to specify in detail. The Breviary is the bulkiest of these, and is usually in four volumes; but if a *Totum* (or one-volume edition), it is far larger than a Missal of similar form and type, having about 1,100 pages compared with 650, as it contains the Psalms, Hymns, Collects, and Lessons for every day in the year, and thus answers to the Morning and Evening Prayer, Psalter, Collects, and Lectionary of the Prayer-Book. The



Ritual, or Book of Occasional Offices, such as Baptism, Matrimony, Burial of the Dead, &c., represented by another portion of our Prayer-Book, is a volume of about 300 pages more, if in the same letter; and the Pontifical, or Book of Offices for Bishops, of which the Confirmation Service and the Ordinal are the sole relics in the Common Prayer, takes up three whole volumes, with an aggregate of about 860 pages in a larger type, reducible to half that number by double columns and a smaller letter. Thus, without counting in the minor books, the Missal is in mere bulk less than *one-third* of the whole—a calculation from which the value of the Reviewer's assertion, whether he knew the facts or not, may be readily assessed. An examination of a small-type Common Prayer-Book yields the following proportions. The whole number of pages is 167. Of these 24 are occupied with the Preface, Kalendar, &c., leaving 143 for all the offices, and of these 45 belong to the Holy Communion and its variable parts—a ratio not very dissimilar to the Roman one.

As to the comparative purity of the Breviary and Missal, and their approximation to Anglican teaching, *when contrasted with popular Romanism*, which was our contention, it is such a mere commonplace of theology and history, seeing that the Prayer-Book is a condensed and recast translation from these very sources, that nothing could justify its denial by any one acquainted with the truth.<sup>1</sup> For example, the Missal (irrespective, of course, of the services for days of modern institution) is, with but trifling exceptions, what it has been for at least twelve hundred years, and the Breviary proper (*i.e.* excluding accretions such as the 'Horæ B.V.M.,' &c.) is almost entirely made up of Scripture, short biographies of Saints (purged by Pope Pius V. of much legendary matter which used to be there), and lessons out of the more eminent early Christian writers, notably S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Gregory the Great, and Venerable Bede. Of Papal supremacy, Mariolatry, indulgences, image-worship, purgatory in its coarser forms, invocation of Saints, and the like, there is practically nothing in the Missal, and exceedingly little in any save some very recent editions of

<sup>1</sup> So Calderwood, in his *Altare Damascenum* (pp. 612, 613), A.D. 1623, observes that 'from three Romish channels was the English Service raked together; namely, 1st, the *Breviary*, out of which the Common Prayer was taken. 2ndly. The *Ritual*, or *Book of Rites*, out of which the Administration of Sacraments, Burial, Matrimony, and Visitation of the Sick are taken. 3rdly. The *Mass-Book*, out of which the Consecration of the Lord's Supper, Collects, Gospels, and Epistles are taken.'

the Breviary, no more, that is, than a conservative revision, such as has been advocated many times within the Latin Church itself, would easily and painlessly remove: whereas nothing short of a wholesale cataclysm could cleanse out the Augean stable of popular Roman cults and devotions.

Before coming directly to the discussion of the second question which the Reviewer has chosen as his battle-ground, we must remind our readers of the emphatic manner in which he insists on the powerful and even dominant influence exercised by Lutheranism, and especially by the Confession of Augsburg, and the Apology for that Confession, on the English Reformation and the authoritative formularies of Anglicanism. We contend that he, following Archbishop Laurence and Archdeacon Hardwick, has overstated the matter, but that is his affair, not ours, after we have once warned our readers of the truth. He tells us expressly, and with iteration, that the Mass is gone in England, and that Lutheran teaching on the Eucharist is of authority here and now.

Very good; now let us hear what the Confession of Augsburg, the most authoritative formulary of Lutheranism, has to say on this head:—'*Falsò accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod Missam aboleant, retinetur enim Missa apud nos, et summâ reverentiâ celebratur, servantur et usitatæ ceremoniæ ferè omnes. . . . Itaque non videntur apud adversarios Missæ majore religione fieri quam apud nos.*'

Next, what says the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg? '*Initio hoc iterum præfandum est, nos non abolere Missam, sed religiosè retinere ac defendere. Fiunt enim apud nos Missæ singulis Dominicis et aliis festis . . . et servantur usitatæ ceremoniæ publicæ, ordo lectionum, orationum, vestitus, et alia similia.*'

Here then are the two witnesses, which have been summoned into court with such a flourish of trumpets, testifying in favour of the defendant and full in the teeth of the prosecution.

It is worthy of remark, too, that whereas the Reviewer lauds the Confession of Augsburg on the ground that 'its adherence to ancient forms is part of its Protestantism,' and whereas we have just shown that amongst those ancient forms retained by it was the Mass, with most of its ceremonies (as is visible in Sweden to-day, with its 'High Mass' and 'Mass-shirt' or chasuble), yet he charges *us* with sheer Romanising for holding the mere literary opinion that there is much similarity between the Prayer-Book and the Missal. This charge, by-the-by, illustrates forcibly enough the curious fact

that there are absolutely no English controversial works of any value against Romanism, except such as have issued from the High Church school, for the Low Church party has been either ignominiously silent or intellectually impotent in polemics. A really shrewd opponent of Rome would see that no stronger or more telling argument against her existing practices can be adduced than appeal to the contradiction to them afforded by the testimony of her own most ancient, sacred, and accredited formularies; but our Reviewer cannot see that, and plays Cardinal Manning's game by giving Romanism all the advantage to be derived from a general attack on documents which are chiefly of the Patristic age in matter and meaning.

And we can readily exhibit from the same Lutheran source the true meaning of the condemnation of 'Sacrifices of Masses' by Article XXXI. It is quite clear that a doctrine that there is a *fresh* act of sacrifice in every Mass, and that each celebration of Mass is in some sense an independent offering, though officially repudiated by the Roman Church, and implicitly condemned by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, chap. iv. quest. 73, which declares that Christ's offering of Himself was once only, and upon the Cross, was widely current at the era of the Reformation, and indeed it is within our own knowledge that it is taught even still, just as a local Presence is, by some of the less educated Roman Catholic clergy. Now the Confession of Augsburg speaks thus:—

'An opinion has gained ground, which has indefinitely multiplied private Masses, namely, that Christ by His Passion made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass, wherein there should be an oblation for daily sins, mortal and venial. Hence flowed a popular opinion that the Mass is an act which by *opus operatum* blots out the sins of the living and dead: whereupon a dispute began whether one Mass said for many persons be equal in value to separate Masses for single persons. This debate gave birth to that boundless multitude of Masses.'

And Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ (in 1633), glossing Article XXXI., observes:—

'*Articulus durissimus videtur: rectius tamen introspicendo, non adeo veritati discordem judicem. Prima pars, quoad affirmativa, indubitata est. . . In verbis posterioribus, si sobriè intelligantur, nihil agitur contra sacrificia Missæ in se, sed contra vulgarem et vulgatam opinionem de ipsis, scilicet quod sacerdotes in sacrificiis offerrent Christum pro vivis et defunctis, in remissionem pœnæ et culpæ, adeo ut virtute hujus sacrificii ab eis oblato independenter à Crucis sacrificio, mereretur populo remissionem. Hæc est vulgata opinio, quam hic perstrinxit Articulus.*'

Having cleared the ground thus, let us come to the Anglican evidence. First of all, there stands the wording in the first Reformed Prayer-Book of 1549: '✠ The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.'

The word disappeared from the second Book of 1552, but did the *thing*? Apparently not, in the minds of contemporaries, for—

(a) The Act of Uniformity, 5 & 6 Edward VI. c. 1, establishing the second Book, speaks of the former one as 'a very godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church,' while implicitly condemning the changes made in the Book of 1552, as due merely to 'doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than of any other worthy cause.'

(b) Latimer, in the Disputation of 1554 at Oxford, said, 'I find no great diversity in them, they are one Supper of the Lord.'

(c) In 1567 Archbishop Parker published (under the significant title of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie, showing the auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the Sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lord, &c.*) a modern English version of the Anglo-Saxon Easter Homily of Archbishop Ælfric (A.D. 995), as a vindication of the Reformed teaching of the Church of England on the Holy Eucharist in his own day, because identical, according to his statement, therewith, save in certain explicitly specified exceptions, being in all other respects agreeable to what the Elizabethan Bishops accepted as sound doctrine. Amongst the passages *not* excepted against is the following (all the more noticeably because there is a note of warning upon the very next paragraph): 'Once suffred Christe hym selfe (*Ebreu* x); but yet neverthesse hys suffrynge is dayle renewed at the masse through mysterye of the holye housell.' This Homily is attested as sound doctrine by the signatures of Archbishop Parker, of Young, Archbishop of York, Grindal, Bishop of London, Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, Horne, Bishop of Winchester, and ten other bishops, namely, Barlow, Scory, Cox, Sandys, Bullingham, Davies, Bentham, Parkhurst, Best, and Robinson, nearly all pronounced Low Churchmen, and likely to favour the least Catholic tenets then permissible.

(d) The second Book, with some minor, though significant alterations, contented the great body of English Roman Catholics for the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign, till the Bull of Excommunication was launched against her.

(e) Contrariwise, this Book of 1552-1559 was hotly de-

nounced as a 'Mass-Book' by the Puritan school, while Calvin described it as 'the leavings of Popish dregs' and as 'trifling and childish'—(*Troubles at Frankfort*, p. xlviii.) It was complained of again and again, as also was our present Book, as virtually retaining the Mass, under pretence of a pure and Scriptural administration of the Supper, and its structure was unfavourably 'compared' with that of the Missal and contrasted with the ordinance as observed in Protestant assemblies; with what degree of truth we will now exhibit by a tabular comparison of the leading factors of three Offices, the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass according to the use of Sarum, the existing Communion Office of 1662, omitting some minor details, and the Directory for Public Worship issued by Parliament in 1644:—

Sarum Missal	Prayer-Book of 1662	Puritan Directory
1. Preparation of Priest	1. Preparation of Priest	1. Exhortation of invitation and warning
2. Confession and Absolution	2. Commandments and <i>Kyrie</i> (ten times)	2. Seating of communicants round the table
3. <i>Kyrie</i> (nine times)	3. Collects, Epistle, and Gospel	3. Reading of the words of institution as a <i>lesson</i> , not as a <i>prayer</i>
4. <i>Gloria in Excelsis</i>	4. Nicene Creed	4. Prayer (extempore) of thanksgiving for mercies and all means of grace, and that God may so sanctify the Ordinance that those who eat and drink may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Christ
5. Collects, Epistle, and Gospel	5. Oblation of Bread and Wine on Altar	5. Joint communion of minister and people, all seated, with no prescribed words of administration
6. Nicene Creed	6. Church Militant Prayer of Oblation and of Commemoration of Living and Departed	6. Exhortation after Communion
7. Oblation of Bread and Wine on Altar	7. Confession and Absolution	7. Thanksgiving
8. <i>Secreta</i> for acceptance of oblation	8. <i>Sursum Corda</i>	
9. <i>Sursum Corda</i>	9. Preface	
10. Preface	10. <i>Sanctus</i>	
11. <i>Sanctus</i>	11. Prayer of Humble Access (for priest and people)	
12. Commemoration of Living	12. Consecration Prayer	
13. Consecration Prayer	13. Communion of Priest	
14. Commemoration of Departed	14. Communion of People (kneeling)	
15. Prayers of Humble Access (for Priest only)	15. Post-Communion Prayers	
16. Communion of Priest	16. <i>Gloria in Excelsis</i>	
17. Communion of People (kneeling)	17. Blessing and Dismissal	
18. Post-Communion Prayers		
19. Blessing and Dismissal		

The structural, theological, and even verbal likeness between columns I. and II. is obvious at a glance, as is also the unlikeness of the third column to both. And the broad distinction is, that on the one hand there is an act of oblation and consecration, attended by other acts of worship, besides the oral reception of the Communion, in the Latin and Anglican rites; whereas, on the other hand, the act of communicating is the one and only intent of the Puritan order; while the one element common to all three, the recitation of the Institution, is in the Directory—as, indeed, in other Puritan forms—studiously dissociated from any action with or over the bread and wine. That is to say, the former are what S. Ambrose, and those of his day, meant by the word *Missa*, when they applied it to the Holy Eucharist; while the latter is little more, at best, than the long-abolished *agape*, or religious club-feast, of ancient Christendom.

It will be seen, on comparison of the Sarum and Caroline offices, that out of the nineteen factors set down in column I. they have fifteen in substantial and often exact verbal agreement, though varying somewhat in order, as is also the case with the several parts in all distinct liturgies. Their chief points of structural difference are the addition of the Decalogue to our present rite, and the condensation of 8, 12, and 14 in column I. into the single 6 of column II., while of course there is a good deal of verbal change, but nothing which can even disguise the practical identity, as to essentials, of the two rites.

As to the Prayer of Consecration itself, we have of course the right to claim that it should be read not only in the light of that of 1549, so highly lauded in the very Act of Parliament which substituted the Book of 1552, but also by that of the Liturgies of the Scottish and American Churches, with which the Church of England is in perfect intercommunion.

The trustworthiness of Dr. Lushington's dictum, 'that the Mass is gone, root and branch,' may be readily tested in this way; and, indeed, it is not unworthy of mention that when this learned judge was acting as assessor to Archbishop Sumner, in condemning Archdeacon Denison, one of the latter's friends obtained for him in court an explicit condemnation of a proposition respecting the Eucharist, as untenable in the Church of England, which happened to be, though he did not know it, an extract from Lancelot Andrewes.

As regards the mode of interpreting such a document as the existing Communion Office, no reasonable doubt can



arise. The Church of England makes incessant appeal to the ancient Christian Church of the first five centuries, in Prayer-Book, Canons, Articles, Homilies, and in such Acts of Parliament and other civil documents as the following (which may perhaps be held by some persons as more weighty and authoritative evidence than any ecclesiastical formularies):—25 Henry VIII. c. xxi.; 34 & 35 Henry VIII. c. i.; 1 Edward VI. c. i.; 2 & 3 Edward VI. c. i.; Proclamation of 1548; Answer to Princess Mary, 1551; 1 Elizabeth, c. ii.; Proclamation against Sectaries; Queen's Declaration, 1569; Proclamation for Uniformity, 1604; 13 & 14 Charles II., &c. And that the two doctrines of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice prevailed universally throughout the ancient Church does not admit of serious dispute; still less that they have been not merely acknowledged, but vigorously asserted, by all the greatest names in Anglican theology. We can find, it is true, denunciations of the Liturgies of the Eastern and Western Churches amongst the less eminent, learned, and respectable Reformers, just as we can find like attacks on baptismal regeneration, as a 'soul-destroying' doctrine and unknown to the Church of England, amongst the more illiterate Evangelicals even still, though nothing like so many as twenty years ago, and a like denial of the lawfulness of private confession, despite the explicit language of the Prayer-Book and Canons.

But a few citations from men whose praise is in all the Churches will not be out of place. We do not propose to construct a long catena, but just to pit some of the most famous writers of Anglicanism against one anonymous contributor to a recent number of a Review, undertaking, as we have seen, to lay down the law for the Church of England, and, as it would seem, doing so in the Nonconformist interest, by assailing the essential doctrines of that Church.

We will take, first, two eminent men, because singled out by the Reviewer himself as supporters of his own views, and will cite them simply to illustrate his position—already made untenable by Edmund Burke—that unlikeness to the Roman Church, even where that Church is in accord with early Christianity, is and ought to be the distinguishing characteristic of the Church of England; and, in giving certain positive extracts from their writings, we are not to be misconstrued as though we intended to conceal or deny the existence of negative expressions, directed against popular Roman teaching, which may also be found in their works:—

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.—'The Roman Church is not a Pro-

testant Church, nor the Protestant Church a Roman Church. Yet both the one and the other may be homogeneous members of the Catholic Church. *Their difference in essentials is but imaginary.*'—(*Works*, vol. ii. p. 86.)

'The Holy Eucharist is a commemoration, a representation, an application of the all-sufficient propitiatory sacrifice of the Cross. If his [Bishop of Chalcedon's] Sacrifice of the Mass have any other propitiating power or virtue in it than to commemorate, represent, and apply the merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross, let him speak plainly what it is. *Bellarmino knew no more of the Sacrifice than we.*'—(Vol. ii. p. 88.)

'Abate us Transubstantiation and those things which are consequent in this determination of the manner of the Presence, and we have no difference with them on this particular.'—(Vol. ii. p. 211.)

'It was not the erroneous opinions of the Church of Rome, but their obtruding them by laws upon other Churches, which warranted a separation.'—(Vol. iii. p. 572.)

BISHOP COSIN:—'I cannot see where there is any real difference betwixt us [and the Church of Rome] about this Real Presence, if we would give over the study of contradiction and understand one another aright. Maldonatus (*De Sacr.* p. 143), after a long examination of the matter, concludes thus at last *with us all*:—"For we do not hold this celebration to be so naked a commemoration of Christ's Body given to death, and of His Blood there shed for us; but that the same Body and Blood is present there in this commemoration (made by the Sacrament of Bread and Wine) to all that faithfully receive it: nor do we say it is so made a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but that, by our prayers also added, we offer and present the death of Christ to God, that for His death's sake we may find mercy; in which respect we deny not this Commemorative Sacrifice to be propitiatory. The receiving of which Sacrament, or participating of which Sacrifice, exhibited to us, we say is profitable only to them that receive it and participate of it; but the prayer that we add thereunto, in presenting the death and merits of our Saviour to God, is not only beneficial to them that are present, but to them that are absent also, *to the dead and living both*, to all true members of the Catholic Church of Christ.'"—(*Notes on the Common Prayer.*)

We might extend quotations of this kind to many pages, but will content ourselves with one more, taken from one of the most eminent and moderate of English divines in the seventeenth century, Henry Hammond, whose *Paraphrase on the New Testament* and *Practical Catechism* are still living and standard works, and who was a sturdy champion of the Church of England against Rome, as well as against Geneva and Zürich:—

'I must confess, I should not have begun the list as he doeth, that "all Roman Catholics believe and reverence the Sacrifice of the

Mass as the most substantial and essential act of their religion: all Protestants condemn and abhor it;" when 'tis visible that the Protestants of the Church of England believe and reverence, as much as any, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as the most substantial and essential act of our religion, and doubt not but the word *Missa*, "Mass," has fitly been used by the Western Church to signify it, and herein abhor and condemn nothing but the corruptions and mutilations which the Church of Rome, without care of conforming themselves to the Universal, have admitted in the celebration'—(Preface to *Despatcher Despatched*.)

And we will close this part of our rejoinder with another extract, taken from the writings of Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of S. David's, a man whose powerful intellect and vast learning were universally confessed, and whom his wildest opponent has never suspected of being other than hostile to the advanced High Church School in the Anglican body:—

'The Church of England . . . has dealt with this subject in a spirit of true reverence, as well as of prudence and charity. She asserts the mystery inherent in the institution of the Sacrament, but abstains from all attempts to investigate and defend it, and leaves the widest range open to the devotional feelings and the private meditations of her children with regard to it. And this liberty is so large, and has been so freely used, that apart from the express admission of Transubstantiation, or of the grossly carnal notions to which it gave rise, and which, in the minds of the common people, are probably inseparable from it, I think there can hardly be any description of the Real Presence which in some sense or other is universally allowed, that would not be found to be authorised by the language of most divines of our Church, and *I am not aware, and do not believe, that our most advanced Ritualists have in fact outstepped those very ample bounds.*'—(*Charge* in 1866, pp. 97, 98.)

Nor has this been the mere esoteric doctrine of a few recluse divines, buried in volumes known only to erudite scholars. On the contrary, every manual of Eucharistic devotion for lay use which achieved real popularity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries testifies to these same facts; as, for example, Dr. Edward Lake's *Officium Eucharisticum*, which went through thirty-one editions between its first issue in 1677 and its comparatively recent reprint in 1846; the old *Companion to the Altar*, which had reached its seventeenth edition in 1738, and was often subsequently issued with special licence from the Crown; and Bishop Thomas Wilson's *Lord's Supper*, which had reached its thirty-second edition from 1736 in 1807, and which is still in steady demand. These are only the more salient examples of a copious devotional literature, differing singularly little in tone

and spirit from the more old-fashioned books formerly in use amongst English Roman Catholics, except so far as the dissimilarity of structural arrangement in the Latin and English rites compelled some variation, and are sufficient proof that if a Puritan can boast that the Mass has indeed disappeared from the Church of England, his vaunt holds good only in the same sense as that of a republican under Hadrian or Severus, who should have dilated on the fact that the Eternal City had bowed to no king since she drove out the Tarquins.

So far, then, as the *Quarterly Reviewer* has staked his case on the rejection of Apostolical Succession and of the 'Mass'—understanding by that word—as did the compilers of the Prayer-Book of 1549, the acknowledgment of the Presence, Adoration, and Sacrifice in the Eucharist, confessed as legally tenable in the Church of England even by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council itself—he has not taken much by his motion. And it is not a little curious that if he had availed himself of the one really plausible argument for fastening the epithet 'Protestant' on the Church of England, namely, that it is part of the official title of that daughter Church in the United States with which she is in full communion, there is the awkward fact that both Apostolical Succession and the Eucharistic Sacrifice are formally expressed in the American Prayer-Book with an explicitness which leaves nothing to be desired. Nay more, as regards this very title of 'Protestant Episcopal,' there is at this moment a powerful agitation on foot in the United States for its abolition, and that not by reason of any great influence of Ritualism, which is but a small factor as yet in America, but desired by moderate Churchmen simply because of the practical mischief which an even seeming classification under such a very dubious and discredited category as Protestantism is found to do to a Church which has to make its way, with no prestige of social establishment, against a multitude of warring sects. And, if we be not misinformed, the chief objection mooted against the proposed change is not theological at all, but legal, on the ground of the difficulties which might arise before the civil courts in respect of a multitude of trusts that have been created under the present designation. How the Protestant idea has failed in the United States as truly, though perhaps not so visibly and indisputably, as in Continental Europe, is shown by Dr. Ewer in his powerful *Conferences*,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Catholicity in its Relationship to Protestantism and Romanism. Six Conferences.* By the Rev. F. C. Ewer. New York, 1878. A work which we heartily commend to all our readers, and not less to the readers of the *Quarterly Review*.

in which, like the great Anglican Churchmen of the seventeenth century, like the early leaders of the Oxford movement, and, we may add, like ourselves, he defends the Catholic theory of the Church alike against the Papal and the Protestant view. We will cite in illustration one paragraph from a sermon at the close of his volume :—

‘The movement of 1833 is but a resurrection of the movement of A.D. 33. In the sixteenth century, the thinking world rejected that adulterated presentment of Christianity known as Romanism, because it was tyranny. In the nineteenth century the thinking world has rejected that other adulterated presentment of Christianity known as Protestantism, because it is utter anarchy. Is it not possible that ancient Catholicity, which is neither Roman nor Protestant, and which once conquered the world in less than four centuries, should, now that it has roused from its long obscurity, regain that world again which Romanism and Protestantism have between them lost?’

Nothing is clearer than that such Protestantism in England, as is not a mere popular *alias* for Anglicanism, is becoming daily less of a religion and more of a mere negation of all positive faith. Two broad facts exhibit this so clearly, that no further evidence is needful. First, as regards the Nonconformist bodies, their unanimity in being willing to have the Bible banished from Board Schools, and thus by degrees from all primary education, provided that the Church might be impeded in her efforts for Christianising the young ; and next, as regards the Evangelical party within the Church itself, the manner in which it has now for twenty years given itself almost exclusively to rancorous litigation and to the use of such vile weapons as hired rioters and suborned prosecutions against a competing school, while it has been ready to cast away one of the Creeds in order to secure allies,—show only too plainly that Christianity counts for little with either of them, and cannot be trusted to stand any vigorous pressure from the unbelieving element with which both these bodies are interpenetrated to the marrow. And we see no wisdom, even on the most earthly and prudential grounds, in giving more prominence to such a disintegrating factor of religious decay.

And with this judgment agrees precisely the language of Dr. Thorold, the junior Evangelical Bishop on the bench, in his recent Pastoral, which we have placed at the head of this article :—

‘First amongst the features of our present distress I put unbelief, because it is the first and greatest. Who does not prefer a grave superstition to a dismal atheism? Thomas Aquinas at least adores

Jesus Christ. Comte, in what he calls Humanity, worships himself. Indisputably, unbelief is a wide expression, since it begins where a subtle Arianism almost imperceptibly parts company from the orthodox formula, and ends by a blank abyss, where modern thinkers blandly inform us that modern research gives no glimpse of a Personal God, and where the human spirit, with all its ineffable hopes, undeveloped powers, and exquisite forces of joy and sorrow, faith and hope, is constantly told that its short life, so full of tragic interest, will be but as the brief sob of a wave as it rises and falls on the shore. The outcome is, that conscience becomes a lie, creation a misfortune, existence a bubble, reason an enigma, and death—the supreme end.'

Such is modern Protestantism, logically reasoned out from the premisses of Luther and Calvin, as David Strauss and others like-minded have not failed to tell us, who confess that though they are Protestants, they are not Christians.

And it is because we know the loyalty of the great majority of the English clergy can be depended on in the main, so that whether they vote by orders or in a separate House, in the event of any crisis of disestablishment, they are sure to resist dangerous neologising more effectually than their Irish brethren did, and not to permit a half-instructed laity to sweep away the ancient landmarks, that we can look forward without dismay. We are no friends to clerical domination over the laity, but it is well to be assured that we run no risk here of the flocks being allowed to drive the shepherds, with small advantage to either.

---

## ART. II.—THE CHRISTIAN POSITION, AND THAT OF ITS OPPONENTS.

1. *Supernatural Religion*. Vols. I., II., III. (London.)
2. Three Articles in the *Fortnightly*, entitled 'The Christian Conditions,' by the Author of *Supernatural Religion*, in reply to Professor Westcott's *Resurrection of Christ, a new Revelation*.
3. *The Bampton Lectures for 1877*. Christian Evidences reviewed in relation to Modern Thought. By Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of S. Paul's. (London, 1878.)

SINCE our former notice of the work at the head of this article, its author, who still preserves his *incognito*, has pub-



lished his third and concluding volume. In point of tone, as far as the imputation of unworthy motives to those whose views he controverts is concerned, it is an improvement on its predecessors ; but here our praise must end. It is characterised throughout by the same one-sidedness as the two former volumes. While its author professes to occupy the judgment-seat of grave impartiality, his reasoning is that of the most thorough-going advocate. In his eyes every variation in the Sacred narrative is a contradiction ; a probability, provided it be in his own favour, which is erected on another probability, and that again on a third, is an unquestionable fact, while the strongest probabilities on the other side are simply ignored ; and where facts are wanting, or obscure, his power to determine what they must have been out of his own subjective consciousness is inexhaustible. Of the capacity to weigh and balance evidence he seems to be utterly destitute ; of his one-sidedness in this respect his elaborate criticism of the Acts of the Apostles and of the history of our Lord's Passion, contained in his third volume, constitute the most singular example we have ever seen. His object is to prove that the Acts is a work written by an unknown writer, not earlier than the last thirty years of the second century ; and that, with the exception of the account of S. Paul's voyage, and one or two other brief passages, it is utterly unhistorical—in fact, a romance written for the purpose of effecting a compromise between opposing parties in the Christian Church. It is impossible here to discuss an argument which is spread over several hundred pages ; but to such an astounding position common sense puts in an objection *in limine*, to the important bearing of which on the case it is impossible that an impartial judge could avoid drawing the attention of the jury. It is this—if the book is, as you allege, a romance, and if its author has committed the number of stupid blunders which you charge him with, how has it come to pass that such a writer, at the end of the second century, has succeeded in composing an historical romance out of his own subjective consciousness, which enters into minute details of facts, the latest of which took place more than a century prior to the composition of his work ; and yet that his numerous allusions to historical and geographical facts, manners and customs, and a number of other minute incidents, are not only in strict conformity with what we know to have been the case from other historical sources, but are constantly receiving additional confirmation, even in points otherwise doubtful, from the numerous discoveries made in

antiquities at the present day? Surely if the Acts of the Apostles is a work such as our author attempts to prove it to be, it requires to be shewn that the theory of its origin which he propounds is within the limits of the possible; yet we fail to find a single attempt to grapple with it. Again, in his criticism of the Passion, he has denied the historical foundation of every event recorded in the Gospels, except the bare fact of the Crucifixion itself. In pursuing this line of criticism, it seems never to have occurred to him that it amounts to a moral impossibility that a wholly fictitious narrative of events which lay at the foundation of the Christian Church, and which must have been intimately known to the original followers of Jesus, can have taken the place of the real history of the Crucifixion at any time during the period in question. Yet this writer who claims the merit of impartiality in his statement of the case never even alludes to this and a number of other moral impossibilities with which his theory is beset.

Another grave defect we must notice. His two former volumes have been subjected to serious criticism; and inaccuracies and defects of reasoning, which even unbelievers admit to be such, have been pointed out, yet this third volume is written as if every position in his two former ones were beyond all question proved. The existence of at least two serious replies he simply ignores, although indications are not wanting that he has read one, if not both, of them. In his articles in the *Fortnightly* (his last production), the author professes to set forth 'the conditions of the Christian argument.' No doubt the account he gives will be eagerly accepted by his unbelieving friends as a true statement of the Christian position. For their benefit therefore, as we believe it to be utterly unreal, we propose to point out to them what in the opinion of modern defenders of Christianity constitutes the essential parts of the Christian position; and we invite them, for the purpose of bringing the controversy between us within reasonable limits, to direct their assaults in future against the key and citadel of the Christian Faith instead of wasting their time and our own over a number of minor issues, under the full assurance that if they can capture the former, all the outworks will fall along with it; but, until they can do so, Christianity will remain intact in all its essential features as the religion of reasonable men. For brevity's sake, as it will be necessary frequently to refer to the author of *Supernatural Religion*, we shall designate him by the letters 'S. R.'

I. Our author strongly objects to the conditions of the

Christian argument as laid down by Professor Westcott. We admit that the form in which two of them are stated is liable to exception. Yet, if we are to discuss the question whether Christianity has originated in the action of a super-human power, or whether it be the mere result of the ordinary forces which energise in man, it is clear that we must assume the truth of certain principles as the starting point of our argument, which neither party has a right to call in question in its subsequent stages. What our assumption must be in this particular case is evident, viz. that we must take for granted the general truth of Theism; for unless a God exists, who is a moral being and not a blind force, all discussions, whether Christianity be or be not a Divine revelation, are simply futile. It is obvious that, if we have no evidence that a God exists who can reveal Himself to man, the question at issue between Christians and unbelievers is at once settled in favour of the latter. Again we will fully agree with 'S. R.' to treat no assumption as valid, for the truth of which we are dependent on the testimony of the Bible alone. Now two of Professor Westcott's assumptions (in the form in which he has stated them) fall under this second head, viz. the second, 'that man was made in the image of God,' and the third, 'that man has fallen.' But both these are unnecessary, because their place can be supplied by two facts, which we have ample means of verifying, quite independently of the testimony of Scripture, viz. first, that mankind, taken as a whole, are in a state of deep moral degradation; and, secondly, that it is in the highest degree desirable that they should be raised to a condition of greater moral elevation. The truth of these two propositions, which contain all that is really essential in those of Professor Westcott, can be disputed by no intelligent unbeliever.

It will doubtless be objected that, if the Christian argument involves the assumption that a God exists, who is also a moral being, it is founded on a plain *petitio principii*. We reply that it does so precisely in the same manner as the science of trigonometry pre-supposes the truth of that of geometry, and in no other. The latter science must be firmly established before we are in a proper position to enter on the study of the former. In a similar manner it is necessary that the principles of Theism should be firmly established on their own independent grounds before we can enter on the question whether Christianity be a Divine revelation. We draw attention to this, because nothing is more common among unbelievers than to urge objections against the Christian argument which are only valid on the assumption of the truth of the principles

of Atheism, Pantheism, or Agnosticism. This course has been frequently adopted by 'S. R.,' although in several places in his works he has expressed his belief in Theism. What is contended for is this: In our reasonings respecting the truth of Christianity, we have no right to begin to argue on the principles of Theism, and then when it suits our convenience, to fall back on the assumption of the truth of one of these alien systems; for if either of them affords an adequate account of the origin of the Universe, the question whether a particular system is or is not a Divine revelation is for ever settled in the negative. The whole discussion which 'S. R.' has raised in his first article, therefore, belongs to an independent subject of investigation, and is improperly introduced into the present discussion.

But the Christian assumption is on other grounds abundantly defensible. Despite the metaphysical difficulties in which the idea of a God is said to be involved, the problem will present itself to the common sense of mankind as follows: A universe, full of adaptations, harmonies, and beauties in numbers surpassing the powers of the human mind fully to comprehend, unquestionably exists. Two alternatives respecting its origin alone are possible. Either it must have been the result of the action of a number of unintelligent forces, everlastingly struggling with their surroundings, or its adaptations, harmonies, and beauty must be due to the action of an intelligent Creator. When the question is thus broadly stated, there can be no doubt which side of the alternative will be embraced by the practical intellect of mankind. It will certainly infer the existence of a Being who, even if he does not correspond to the abstract conception of the Infinite, is yet incomprehensibly great and wise; and when it balances the evidence for the existence of such a Being which is above referred to, against the objection (1) that our ideas of the Infinite, the Absolute, and the First Cause are mutually contradictory; or (2) that personality is inconsistent with infinity; or (3) that it is nothing better than anthropomorphism to infer the presence of intelligence in the construction of the universe from its adaptations, harmonies, and beauty,—all but a small minority of peculiarly constituted minds will pronounce the balance of evidence in favour of Theism to be simply overwhelming. This being so, the assumption with which the Christian argument starts is amply justified.

II. The question of the probability of a Revelation.—'S. R.' strongly objects, both in his work and in his first article, against any assumption on the part of the Christian

advocate that a Revelation is antecedently probable. The view of the subject taken by Mr. Mill in his posthumous *Essays* states our position in a manner amply sufficient for all the requirements of the Christian argument. It may be briefly stated as follows:—The moral degradation of mankind is a palpable fact, which no amount of scepticism can question. If, therefore, a God exists who cares for man, the expectation of some further interposition in his favour is not irrational, and may so far be viewed as antecedently probable. Let 'S. R.' prove that Mr. Mill's reasoning is invalid, and let him observe that it will be no answer to show that Mr. Mill has painted the condition of man in colours unduly dark. After every abatement has been made for this, the fact that mankind, taken as a whole, are in a condition of moral degradation remains beyond reasonable question; and therefore, if a God exists who cares for man, the expectation of some interposition in his favour possesses the degree of antecedent probability which the argument requires.

III. The position which miracles occupy in the Christian argument.—'S. R.,' and a multitude of other writers on his side of the question, have taken it for granted that the sole claim of Christianity to be accepted as a Divine Revelation is its alleged miraculous attestation; and that the only ground on which certain doctrines, which reason never could have discovered for itself, can be accepted, is a number of miracles, wrought for the express purpose of attesting their truth. If, therefore, miracles be the *sole* attestation of what 'S. R.' calls 'such astounding propositions' as the Christian doctrines, we are justified in demanding a proof of their actual performance, such as will satisfy the technicalities of legal evidence.

The assumption of unbelievers that Christians rely solely on a miraculous attestation as the one great, if not the sole proof of the Divine origin of Christianity, however inaccurate it is, need not excite our surprise, for this line of reasoning has been adopted by no inconsiderable number of Christian advocates during the last century and the first half of the present. But the all important question, however, is not what are the views propounded by modern writers on this subject, but what were those entertained by the authors of the New Testament, and by those who first of all were convinced of the truth of Christianity. It is simply absurd for modern writers, however learned, to assign to miracles a place in the Christian argument that was not recognised by our Lord or His Apostles. As the limits of this article render the full discussion of this question impossible, we may refer the reader

to Mr. Row's *Bampton Lectures*, as named at the head of this article, where it has been treated at considerable length.<sup>1</sup> All that can be done here is to state the conclusions which have been deduced after careful examination of the evidence :

'First, they affirm that our Lord's Divine Person is self-evidential ; and that the various manifestations of the Divine which have been exhibited in Him, whether they are recorded in the New Testament, or subsequently manifested in history, constitute the highest evidence that He came forth from God, and therefore that they ought to be placed in the front of the Christian argument.

'Secondly, that the evidential value of miracles, viewed as objective facts in the physical universe, is subordinate to this ; and in estimating it, it is necessary to take into account the moral impress which they bear.

'Thirdly, that while all miracles, as being manifestations of the Divine on the sphere of the human, have an indirectly evidential value: a considerable number of those wrought by our Lord were not performed for the purposes of proof, but stand in the same relation to him as ordinary actions do to other men.

'Fourthly, that while several of the Apostolic miracles were wrought for the express purpose of proving to those who witnessed them the truth of our Lord's Resurrection, and of His Messianic character consequent thereon, a very considerable number of them were wrought for merely providential purposes, and consequently were only indirectly evidential.

'Fifthly, that the great evidential miracle of Christianity is the Resurrection of our Lord, which, if it can be proved to have been an objective fact, will carry all the other miracles in the Gospels along with it ; that is to say, they will require no stronger proof than that which is required to establish the ordinary facts of history.'

If, therefore, these five propositions are correct statements of the grounds on which the writers of the New Testament claimed that our Lord's mission should be accepted as Divine, it is clear that the *moral* evidences of Christianity bear the chief weight of its evidential position, and that miracles, viewed as mere objective facts in the physical universe, occupy a subordinate place. Their position in its evidential scheme is best set forth in a brief saying which the author of the fourth Gospel has attributed to our Lord. 'If ye believe not Me, believe the works, that ye may see and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in Him.' These words affirm that He who uttered them viewed His entire working, taken as a whole, as affording the strongest evidence that He came from God ; and that His miracles, viewed apart from the moral impress which they bore as mere wonders and mighty deeds,

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Evidences viewed in relation to Modern Thought*, 1877.



were addressed to those who failed to appreciate the morally Divine which dwelt within Him. As an illustration of this, we remark that numerous as are the miracles recorded in the Gospels, only two of them are alleged to have been performed with a directly evidential purpose,<sup>1</sup> the remainder generally being attributed to His Divine compassion as the reason which led Him to perform them.

'S. R.', and many writers of his school, declare that our sole ground for believing in certain transcendental doctrines of Christianity is the evidence of miracles. To this there is one conclusive reply:—that not a single miracle referred to in the New Testament is alleged to have been performed for the purpose of proving the truth of either a doctrine or a moral precept. When referred to as evidence, they are appealed to as affording proof of one thing only—the reality of a Divine mission. The author of the fourth Gospel has attributed to our Lord numerous strong assertions respecting His superhuman character; but when these were called in question, He is never once described as offering to prove their truth by the performance of a miracle. On the contrary, He appeals to the perfection of His knowledge, of His holiness, and of His veracity as the reason why His testimony should be accepted as true; and then He adds, in the language of the passage above referred to, 'If ye believe not Me, believe the works,' thus obviously assigning to His miracles, viewed apart from their moral associations, not the first, but the second place, as attestations of His Divine character.

If, then, such were the views which were entertained by the first teachers of Christianity, who had to make good their Master's claims to be accepted as the Messiah against a hostile world, it follows that they must have been far better judges of the position which miracles ought to occupy in the Christian argument than even the most learned men of the present day. Circumstances may have so changed as to render it necessary for us to vary the form of the argument; but nothing can justify our departing from its fundamental principles as laid down by our Lord and His Apostles. If then in the Apostolic age moral evidence held the first place, and the miracles were subsidiary, much more must this be the case, now that upwards of eighteen centuries have elapsed since their alleged performance; so that mere lapse of time has made the historical investigation a very complicated one,

<sup>1</sup> The cure of the paralytic, in proof that He had power on earth to forgive sins; and the resurrection of Lazarus, 'that the people which stood by might believe that the Father had sent him.'

in consequence of no small portion of the materials for forming a judgment, which were available in the first century, having hopelessly perished, and from a variety of other causes.

But this line of reasoning is also one which is suggested by the principles of common sense, for it allows an appeal to facts which admit of easy and unquestionable verification. If one thing connected with this controversy is more certain than another, it is that the writers of the New Testament concur in depicting Jesus as a superhuman person. This is equally true of the moral aspects of His character, as it is of Him as a worker of miracles. Such a pretension can be brought to the test of facts, as the tree is known by its fruits. If Jesus Christ was a superhuman person, He ought to have exerted an influence on the history of the world which has been exerted by no one else beside Him; if His claim to be the light of the world be just, His illuminating power ought to be distinctly visible in the facts of the past and of the present. Whether these and other kindred claims have been vindicated is a question, not of theory, but of simple fact. If His influence on history has been absolutely unique, if it has differed from that of all other great men, single or united, if this can be proved by the facts of the last eighteen hundred and fifty years, then His superhuman claims are vindicated by the unmistakable evidence of facts. But if, while the writers of the New Testament have attributed to Him a superhuman character, His action on history cannot be distinguished from that of ordinary great men, then His claims are hopelessly discredited. This line of reasoning possesses the especial merit of bringing the controversy between Christians and unbelievers to the precise test which is demanded by scientific thought,—that, namely, of *verification*.

Add to this that these moral evidences of Christianity have a cogency at the present day far greater than they could have had to our Lord's contemporaries; for, instead of being weakened, they have only grown with the lapse of time. True, the few who were in habitual intercourse with Him were capable of witnessing the manifestations of His Divine character, and of forming their own judgments respecting it; but, if we cannot participate in this advantage, we can verify the truth of His pretensions by an appeal to the history of the past and the facts of the present in a manner impossible to them. Do they justify His superhuman claims? Is He the one character in history who stands forth in unique and solitary grandeur? Does He alone of the sons of men exert an influence which is supremely attractive to every condition

of the human heart, and form the mightiest power in the moral world, more than eighteen centuries after the termination of His earthly life? These are questions to which history returns no uncertain answer. The might of His influence cannot be disputed. It follows, therefore, if it has been one which has been exerted by none other beside Him, that it is absolutely unique; or, in other words, that it proves the presence of the *superhuman*.

It is impossible to deny the validity of this line of reasoning, for it is one which is strictly in accordance with the requirements of modern investigation. Nothing more, however, can be done here than to hint at its general character. It is impossible, within the assigned limits, to sketch even the outlines of the argument, which requires a considerable space for its elaboration. To this aspect of it the first four *Bampton Lectures* (1877) and their six Supplements are devoted; and to attempt to state it in a more concise form would deprive it of its logical value. The attention of sceptical writers, and 'S. R.' in particular, is invited to this portion of the Christian argument; which has never yet been fairly grappled with. 'S. R.' informs us in his preface that 'his work is the result of many years of earnest and serious investigation, undertaken in the first instance for the regulation of personal belief,' yet its careful perusal leaves one under the impression that he has never even heard that Christianity rests on a body of moral evidences, which require to be grappled with as much as those which are usually regarded as miraculous. If he attempts, on any future occasion, to deal with this portion of the argument, he should grapple with its main issues, and not with mere points of detail; for objections may be urged against the latter which leave the former untouched. 'S. R.' has complained that he has received this mode of treatment from several of his critics. If his charge is just, it is surely incumbent on him not to follow a bad example; yet his own work forms a remarkable illustration of the practice which he condemns.

IV. The historical argument. —A few observations will be here necessary as to the mode in which 'S. R.,' who in this respect follows a multitude of unbelieving critics, deals with the historical portions of the Christian argument, because it either overlooks or evades the essential point of the controversy, for, unless it can be subverted, the essence of Christianity, as distinct from its adjuncts, remains unshaken. His mode of attack compels him to assail not only the superhuman (this word is used advisedly rather than supernatural)

elements of the New Testament, but even the ordinary details of the narratives of the Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles as unhistorical; and this to such a degree that, if his criticisms are just, his reader must conclude that hardly a single incident referred to rests on a trustworthy historical foundation. His manner of dealing with our Lord's Passion, which has been already referred to, may be taken as a singular instance of this mode of criticism. A brief passage may be quoted as an illustration of his method:—

'Let no one,' says 'S. R.,' 'suppose that in freely criticising the Gospels we regard without deep emotion the actual incidents which lie at the bottom of these narratives. No one can form to himself any adequate conception of the terrible sufferings of the Master, maltreated and insulted by a base and brutal multitude, too degraded to understand His noble character, and too ignorant to understand His elevated teaching, without keen pain.'

'S. R.' then proceeds to subject the details of the narrative of the Passion to a rigid criticism, and if his method is a just one he does not leave us a single detail as historically reliable. It does not seem to have occurred to him that by thus destroying the truthfulness of the incidents he leaves little or nothing to excite our 'deep emotion.' He will doubtless reply that he has left the fact of the Crucifixion unassailed, even while he consigns all its details, and those of the Last Supper, to the regions of mythology. But if his method of historical criticism is correct, it is hard to discover what grounds we have for believing that Jesus 'was maltreated and insulted by a base and brutal multitude,' nay, more, why the fact of the Crucifixion itself should not be matter of mythological invention. On the principles adopted by writers of this school, it may full well have been a legend fabricated to embody certain theological tendencies.

The first 219 pages of 'S. R.'s' work are occupied with a laboured attempt to establish two positions, which, if true, would settle for ever the controversy between Christians and unbelievers, and render the historical investigation a mere work of supererogation. The first of these is that miracles are, on *à priori* grounds, incredible, and the belief in them irrational; the second is that the followers of Jesus and the early Christians were so intensely credulous and superstitious as to deprive their testimony of all historical value. As to the former, we are absolved from discussing it by the fact that the validity of a large portion of the reasoning proceeds on the assumption of the truth of the principles of Atheism, Pantheism, or Agnosticism; whereas 'S. R.' not only pro-

fesses himself a Theist, but objections founded on the truth of these systems are, as has been pointed out, invalid by the conditions of the Christian argument. As to this portion of the subject the defender of Christianity may accept the principles laid down by Mr. J. S. Mill in his *Logic* and his posthumous *Essays* as a fair statement of the *a priori* position of the argument. It is true that 'S. R.' has done his best to controvert those propounded by Mr. Mill in his *Logic*, but his reasoning is too obviously inconclusive to require to be noticed here. Let unbelievers, if they can, prove Mr. Mill's positions invalid. The Christian argument requires nothing more than he concedes. One might have hoped that this portion of the question might have been considered settled.

But his second thesis is very important, because it is habitually used throughout his entire work to throw discredit, on *a priori* grounds, on all the documents of primitive Christianity, and as a proof of the worthlessness of the testimony of the followers of Jesus to all facts involving the superhuman. The point which he desires to prove is that the early believers were to the last degree credulous and superstitious. It is necessary to establish this, because it affords the only means of accounting for the miraculous narratives of the Gospels without imputing deliberate fraud. His mode of reasoning is so striking an illustration of his method of dealing with historical questions that it deserves to be briefly stated. It is as follows :—

First, he carefully ransacks the extant literature of several centuries before the Christian era, and selects a number of the most grossly superstitious and preposterous beliefs entertained during the times in question. These he carefully parades for the purpose of proving that the Jews, as a nation, were intensely credulous and superstitious. Next, Josephus is summoned to give similar testimony. Even this is not enough : but he goes on with a choice selection of superstitious beliefs entertained by the early Fathers. The whole is presented to us in the form of a single picture, and we are invited to infer that the followers of Jesus were a prey to a similar mass of superstitions. On these grounds it is affirmed that the persons on whose reports the miraculous narratives of the Gospels were founded were so intensely credulous as to deprive their testimony of all historical value. Such a mode of reasoning would make short work with the writers of any age or nation whose historical testimony it is desirable to discredit. Nothing more is necessary than to make a selection of gross superstitions from the history of the past or the present,

and charge them on any particular author or his informants, and then aver that his testimony to any unusual occurrence is worthless. Yet this is really the course adopted by 'S. R.' for the purpose of invalidating the testimony of the primitive followers of Jesus.

It is evident that the only legitimate mode of determining how far a particular author is the prey of superstition or credulity is by investigating his own writings on this subject. It is absurd to credit him with superstitions, of which they afford no trace, on the vague ground that he lived in a credulous and superstitious age. The same principles would justify future critics in bringing a like charge against several eminent writers of the present day, because it is a fact that large numbers of people, and even a few scientific men, believe in the absurdities of 'Spiritualism.' What can be more absurd than to credit the authors of the Gospels with all the superstitions which may have been current some centuries before or after their birth, or even all those of their own age, without proof is given that they were a prey to them. They are clearly only responsible for those to which their own pages testify. This is true in any case; but as their story is a miraculous one, it is certain that if they were so intensely superstitious, as this theory presupposes, the subject on which they wrote would have called this spirit into active energy, and their pages would have contained narratives equally grotesque. It is hardly needful to observe that to urge their belief in miracles as a proof of their extreme credulity, when the truth of miracles is the question at issue, is simply to assume the point which has to be proved.

But 'S. R.' seems wholly unconscious that in attributing such an extreme degree of credulity and superstition to the followers of Jesus as he has endeavoured to fasten on them in his fifth and sixth chapters, and assumes as proved throughout his entire argument, he is cutting the ground from under his own feet. His object is to prove that the Gospels consist of a mass of myths and legends; and his zeal to effect this blinds him to the following all-important consideration.

There is another fact, besides the presence of the miraculous narrative in the Gospels, which requires to be accounted for—the existence in them of a body of moral teaching, the elevation of which an overwhelming majority of unbelievers have concurred in admiring. Yet unbelieving critics seem totally unaware that it is necessary to prove that its existence in them is compatible with the theories of their origin which



they propound. Will they or even 'S. R.' pretend that this moral teaching is the creation of a body of enthusiasts who were sunk in the lowest depths of credulity and superstition? If he has succeeded in proving his case, it is certain that the primitive Christians must have consisted of a body of men who were intellectually degraded to the utmost extent. But such a mental condition is incompatible with a high state of moral elevation. If, therefore, the followers of Jesus were such as 'S. R.'s' position compels him to maintain, it is impossible that they can have created the moral elements of the Gospels. But if to escape this difficulty he takes refuge in Mr. Mill's assumption, that while the miraculous stories may have been the inventions of His followers, it is inconceivable that their moral elements can have been their creation, and consequently that these must be referred to the genius of the Great Teacher Himself, then it follows necessarily that large portions of the Gospels must rest on a firm historical basis; and among them must be some of those miraculous narratives whose high moral impress is unmistakable.

This is not all. 'S. R.'s' theory, and that of a large number of unbelievers, is that the Gospels consist of a mass of myths and legends, the inventions of a number of credulous enthusiasts, which gradually grew up during the first century, and which in the course of time took the place of the real facts of the life of the Founder of Christianity. These myths and legends then were the invention of a considerable number of people, whose intellectual and moral calibre was such as is described by 'S. R.,' and out of this mass of materials four unknown writers, at a comparatively late period, composed our Gospels. This, stated briefly, is the theory of modern unbelief, which the reasonings of 'S. R.' in his three volumes are intended to prove.

Let us invite his attention and that of his unbelieving friends to the following considerations. Our Gospels, whether genuine histories or bundles of legends, contain the delineation of a character, viz. that of Jesus Christ, which without contradiction is the grandest and most perfect ever conceived of by man. This is allowed even by a large number of unbelievers. Here, at any rate, we are in the region of fact; for it is one which cannot help being recognised on a simple perusal of their pages. Now of what does this character consist? To this question there is only one possible answer: that it is not due to any artificial delineation, but to the combined effect produced on the mind by their entire contents. These all form one harmonious unity. The character has

indeed been cavilled at on some minor points; but even if the objections are admitted to be valid (as they are not), the unity of the grand residuum is fully sufficient for the purpose of our argument. If, therefore, the theory is correct that the Gospels consist of bundles of myths and legends, the fabrication of many persons, which have been inartificially put together by four compilers, the question urgently demands solution—how has the unity of this exquisite delineation, which has commanded the love, reverence, and adoration of the wisest and the best during a period of eighteen centuries, got into their pages?

To those who admit the general historical truthfulness of the Gospels (the argument does not require the admission of that of every minor detail) this question admits of a conclusive answer. The portraiture is there, because it is a delineation taken from the *life*. Let us now interrogate those who affirm that the Gospels are masses of myths and legends, how in conformity with their theory it must have originated? Only one answer is possible. Numbers of superstitious and credulous Christians during the course of the first century set themselves to the work of inventing a number of legendary stories, which were gradually attributed to Jesus, and took the place of the real facts of His earthly life. Out of a mass of materials of this kind the Evangelists, or those from whom they copied, during some period of the second century, composed the Gospels; and lo! out of this mass of legendary matter the harmonious unity of the fourfold delineation of the portraiture of Jesus originated, by the mere juxtaposition of the myths and legends which compose our Gospels! If this is the true account of the origin of the great portraiture, its creation constitutes as great a miracle as any recorded in their pages. It is as incredible as the theory that one of our greatest paintings has originated by the casual collection of the various figures which compose it, the works of various artists, by placing them side by side on the canvas.

But this is far from constituting the whole of the difficulty. As has been already observed, the theory which we are considering renders it necessary to assume that those who invented the myths and legends, and those who mistook them for facts, were to the last degree credulous, superstitious, and fanatical. Consequently, as the inventors of the legends must have been the real creators of the character, it follows that a number of persons thus intellectually and morally degraded must have fortuitously invented a number of legends of a lofty moral type, which, when placed side by side, have created a charac-

ter so elevated and perfect, that so eminent a man as Mr. Mill has arrived at the conclusion, that Christianity has done well in making its Founder, rather than the author of nature, the centre of its worship. He has also declared in his posthumous *Essays*, that it is utterly incredible that either the moral teaching or the character of Jesus, as delineated in the Gospels, can have been the invention of His followers, or of the early Christians, or even of the Apostle Paul, on the ground that both are immeasurably above the moral atmosphere which they habitually breathed. In this opinion every person who considers the subject must concur.

Here, however, there is one consideration which Mr. Mill has evidently overlooked. He thinks it possible that the early followers of Jesus may have invented all the miracles which have been attributed to Him. If this is the case, supposing Him to have been a mere man, they must also have invented all the superhuman aspects of His character; yet not only are the narratives of miracles stamped with the same high moral ideal as His teaching, but the human and the superhuman aspects of His character are woven into an harmonious unity; and present not the smallest trace of diversity of authorship. Still more in those places of the Evangelists where a highly superhuman character is attributed to Jesus (as in Matt. xxv. 31-46), the elevation of His moral character stands out with pre-eminent brightness. If, therefore, it is inconceivable that the followers of Jesus can have invented His moral teaching, or the general aspects of His character, it is equally impossible that the other portions of the Divine delineation can have been their invention, for it is elevated equally high above their spiritual ken.

The above considerations, therefore, prove that every theory which is propounded to account for the miraculous narratives in the Gospels on the supposition that they are unhistorical, *ought* at the same time to afford an adequate explanation of the great portraiture which is delineated in their pages, because the one is made up of the same materials as the other. If, therefore, the legendary theory, and all its various modifications, utterly fail to account for the origin of the portraiture, it is impossible that they can be a true account of the origin of either the miraculous narratives, or of the superhuman aspects of our Lord's character, for both are indelibly stamped with the same elevated moral impress. It is needless to pursue the argument further, for the suggestion that the portraiture of the Jesus of the Evangelists has resulted from the fortuitous placing together of a number of

legends invented by a body of superstitious and credulous fanatics, is to offer an insult to our reason.

Only an imperfect outline of this mode of reasoning can be here given. It is, however, impossible to deny that it possesses great weight. If so, it has a most intimate bearing on the questions discussed by 'S. R. ;' yet he has not once referred to it in his three volumes. This can only be attributed to one of two causes : either he is ignorant of its existence, and in that case his acquaintance with the literature of the subject must be imperfect, for the argument had been several years before the world when he published the two first volumes of his work ; or he has found it more convenient to ignore it than to answer it. It is now pressed on the attention of both him and of his unbelieving friends.

The most elaborate portion of 'S. R.'s' work is that in which he has attempted to prove that the references alleged to have been made in the remains of the early Patristic and heretical literature now extant to the canonical Gospels, are wholly insufficient to establish the fact that any writer who flourished prior to the last thirty years of the second century has actually quoted any one of them. From this the inference is drawn that their authorship is involved in the deepest uncertainty ; and that they came into existence only a short time prior to that date ; and consequently that they are valueless as witnesses to events which happened a century and a quarter previously. To this investigation 'S. R.' has devoted more than half of his first, and the whole of his second volume. It may, therefore, be concluded that he considers this portion of his work as of pre-eminent importance, and that if he has succeeded in establishing his positions, he has dealt a mortal blow to the historical evidence of Christianity. In adopting this line of reasoning, he is simply following in the wake of a multitude of unbelieving critics. The object which they seek to effect is evident ; they consider that if it can be shown that our canonical Gospels were composed at a comparatively late date by unknown authors, not only is their value as historical documents destroyed, but ample time is afforded for the growth of the mass of legendary matter, which they affirm to have been incorporated into their pages, and to have taken the place of the real facts of the life of the Founder of the Christian Church, respecting whom we now know little or nothing that is worthy of credit.

Into the details of this argument it is superfluous to enter. 'S. R.' may be left in the hands of Professors Lightfoot, Sanday, and others, who have unquestionably proved that

he has committed several considerable blunders, and drawn conclusions which his premisses will not justify. The argument itself consists of a vast amount of minute criticism of passages in the Patristic writings compared with others bearing a close resemblance to them in the Gospels. Three qualifications (which are united in few persons) are absolutely necessary for forming a judgment of any value on this species of reasoning: first, an intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers; secondly, a mind which has received a special training in the principles of historical criticism; and, thirdly, a thoroughly impartial judgment. Now, it is fully admitted that there is great interest in these subjects from a critical, and even a theological point of view; but that a great question, such as the truth or falsehood of Christianity, can be dependent on a number of minute issues, of which the mental training of hardly one man in twenty thousand constitutes him a competent judge, is simply incredible. The following brief remarks will be devoted to show that, even if it be conceded, for the sake of argument, that 'S. R.' has proved everything which he has attempted to establish, he leaves the historical argument on which the truth of Christianity depends absolutely untouched.

What, then, viewing the question as a purely historic one, is the vital point in this controversy? It is not whether four individuals, called Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, respecting whom our information is at best but scanty, composed our Gospels, some time between A.D. 60 and A.D. 90, but whether there is evidence that these Gospels, by whomsoever composed, are in all their great outlines accurate representations of the traditions of the primitive followers of Jesus—I say in their great outlines—for as far as the present controversy is concerned it is unnecessary to maintain that they are so in all their minute details. The following, therefore, is the real point at issue in this controversy, viewed as one simply historical and divested of the theological questions which have been needlessly introduced into it:—Do or do not the Patristic writings afford satisfactory evidence that the traditions of the primitive followers of Jesus attributed to Him a superhuman character, and ascribe to Him a number of superhuman actions, similar in kind to those attributed to Him in our Gospels?

What light does the reasoning of 'S. R.' throw on this question? 1. It makes it clear that if the alleged citations and references of the Fathers to the Synoptics do not so exactly agree with the corresponding passages in the Gospels as to amount to an actual demonstration that they were in posses-

sion of one or more of them, yet their correspondence is so close as to render it highly probable that it was so. In proof of this the numerous references contained in the writings of Justin Martyr to our Lord's life and teaching may be referred to as a crucial example.

II. But on the following points his writings afford not merely probable, but demonstrative evidence. 1. That Justin was in possession of certain documents, which he designates as 'Memoirs of the Apostles and their Companions,' which, as far as their title is concerned, is a sufficiently accurate description of our present Gospels. 2. That in his day these were publicly read in the Christian assemblies. 3. That if these 'Memoirs of the Apostles and their Companions' were not our Gospels, Justin's references make it certain that their accounts of the actions and teaching of Jesus Christ so closely resembled those in the Synoptics that the difference between them in an historical point of view is unworthy of notice; that is to say, Justin's 'Memoirs' and our Gospels must have told substantially the same story in all its great outlines. 4. That any incidents connected with the actions and teaching of Jesus with which Justin was acquainted, and which he accepted as authoritative, other than those in our Gospels, were extremely few in number, and were of precisely the same type as those contained in them.

Let us appeal to facts. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that 'S. R.' has proved (which he has not) that Justin's 'Memoirs' were not our Gospels, what does the difference between the one and the other really amount to? Carefully counted, the references in his writings to events in our Lord's life and teaching are about two hundred in number. Of these about 196 agree substantially with the statements in our Gospels. Only about four differ from them, and these relate to matters perfectly immaterial. Without affirming that this computation is completely accurate, it is approximately so. Consequently, the incidents connected with our Lord's ministry, which Justin accepted as authentic, differed from those recorded in the Synoptics by the inconsiderable number of two per cent. It is marvellous, when we consider that Justin's historical recollections were separated from the close of our Lord's ministry by about the same interval of time which separates us from the death of the founder of Wesleyanism, that he should have preserved so few incidents respecting it which vary from those in our Gospels, rather than that those which he has referred to, should present the slight variations which they do. In Justin's time traditionary reminiscences



must have been both numerous and fresh. Many persons now living have conversed with persons who heard J. Wesley preach; Justin stood in a similar position with respect to the primitive followers of Jesus.

But we may advance a step further. If 'S. R.' could prove that Justin Martyr made use of several documents which were not our Gospels, it would only strengthen our historical position. The more numerous the documents which he had before him, the more certain would it be that they embodied the various forms of those traditions which were current in the Church during the times in which he lived. All historians are agreed that our knowledge of past events is far more accurate when we possess several authorities than when our knowledge is derived exclusively from one.

The same line of reasoning which is applicable to Justin, is no less so to the remains of the earlier Patristic literature, with the reservation that the references to our Lord's actions and teaching are less numerous. As far as they go, however, they are in substantial agreement with those in the Synoptics. Stating the case generally, the actions and sayings attributed to our Lord in all the remains of Christian literature between A.D. 90 and A.D. 170, the complete counterparts of which cannot be found in our present Gospels, are about twelve in number. This being so, the difference between the traditions of the Church and those embodied in the Synoptics are, for the purposes of history, devoid of the smallest importance.

Such is a very general statement of the position now taken respecting the laboured argument of 'S. R.,' which occupies more than half his work. If he wishes to see the argument considered in a manner more worthy of its importance, we may refer him to the fifth Bampton Lecture of 1877, which is entirely occupied with the discussion of it. The four conclusions deduced as the result of the investigation are as follows: First, that no legendary matter worthy of the notice of the historian, which was invented as late as the last ten years of the first century, can have been incorporated into the pages of the Synoptics. Secondly, that the traditions of the same period attributed to Jesus a number of miraculous actions, nearly all of them identical, and all of them of the same type and character as those which are contained in our Gospels, and wholly differing in type and character from those which are narrated in the apocryphal ones. Thirdly, that the actions and the religious and moral teaching which these traditions attributed to Him are, for all practical purposes, the same as that which we read in the Synoptics. Fourthly,

that if the narrative of the Synoptics contain a mass of legendary matter, these legends must have been invented between the years A.D. 30 and A.D. 90, or during the sixty years which followed the conclusion of our Lord's ministry.

This being so, unbelievers ask us to accept the following astonishing position, that during this interval of time a number of legends were invented, which not only succeeded in obscuring, but in usurping the place of, the true facts of the life of the Founder of the Church during a period when it must have been crowded by those who had received their Christianity from the original followers of Jesus, and during a considerable portion of which many, if not most, of them must have been still surviving.

But further, the unique character of the Christian Church among institutions rendered it an absolute necessity to its existence that it should have preserved, in lively recollection, the chief events of its Founder's life. This arose from the fact that it was *He Himself*, what He was, and what He did, and not a body of mere doctrines or precepts, that constituted the foundation on which it was built and the bond of union among its members. The Apostolic Epistles render the fact indisputable, that the daily religious life of the early Christian had for its centre not simply the doctrines but the person of Jesus Christ. A Christian was a Christian because he believed that Jesus was the Messiah. What did such a belief involve? Two things, at least—first, a general knowledge of the nature of the Messianic office; secondly, an acquaintance with a body of facts, which in the opinion of the believer proved Jesus to be the Messiah. This therefore necessitated the preservation of the chief events of His life in vivid recollection. How was it alone possible for the Christian missionary to make a convert? If he addressed himself to a Jew, it behoved him to prove that the facts of the life of Jesus corresponded to the Messianic elements of the Old Testament; but if to a Gentile, he had not only to adduce facts which proved Him to be the Christ, but to explain the nature of the office itself. In either case the knowledge of the chief events of His life was a matter of absolute necessity; and unless this was preserved in the Church it never could have made a single convert, and must consequently have perished of inanition. This consideration alone is sufficient to prove that it is simply impossible, that at any time during the sixty years which followed the Crucifixion, a body of legends could have been invented which could have taken the place in the different Christian communities of those facts

on the belief in which their original Christianity was founded, and this while considerable numbers of the original followers of Jesus were still surviving. But, further, this period of sixty years must be considerably reduced ; for the mode in which the references are made in the Patristic writings prove that the traditions then current were of no recent invention.

It is therefore submitted that these considerations, apart from other most weighty arguments, are destructive of every form of the mythic or legendary theories. They prove that there was no possible time when a number of legends could have been invented, and have taken the place of the well-known facts on which Christianity was based. The truth of the miraculous narratives of the Gospels is a separate question ; but it is impossible to account for their origin on the ground that they were invented between A.D. 30 and A.D. 90, and that during that interval they succeeded in supplanting the genuine traditions. Whatever they are, they must in all their great outlines represent the beliefs of the primitive followers of Jesus.

Sixthly, the value of S. Paul's Epistles as historical documents.—But on the subject we have been considering, we are not left to inference ; we possess historical evidence of the highest order in the writings of the Apostle Paul, whose four chief Epistles are admitted by the great body of unbelieving critics with singular unanimity to be his genuine productions, and the authenticity of four more is conceded by no inconsiderable number. The discussion of the evidential value of these letters as historical documents, and the points which they are valid to prove, is impossible within the limits of this article. But as an illustration of their value it may be observed that the period which intervened between the termination of our Lord's ministry and the composition of the two earliest of these Epistles is about the same which separates us of the present year from the proclamation of Napoleon III. as Emperor of the French ; the four great Epistles from the year of the dethronement of Louis Philippe ; and the latest from the repeal of the Corn Laws. This fact is mentioned for the purpose of showing how vivid must have been the recollections of the events of our Lord's ministry when they were composed, and how ample must have been the means of information respecting it. And not only so, but S. Paul's personal action as a persecutor of Christianity cannot be dated later than four or five years after the Crucifixion ; and his position as such renders it certain that he must have

made himself thoroughly acquainted with the traditions of the primitive followers of Jesus.

This being the case, a question of the highest importance presents itself. What is the amount of light which these Epistles throw on the traditions current in the Church during the thirty years after the Crucifixion respecting the character of the actions which they attributed to our Lord? Their direct references to His teaching and actions are few in number; but their indirect ones are very numerous. These are even more valuable as historical testimony than the direct, proving, as they do, that the Apostle and His opponents were at one respecting that great outline of facts which constituted the essence of Christianity. They prove the following points as matters of absolute certainty:—

First. That the Church, during this entire period, was in possession of an account of our Lord's teaching and actions which formed the groundwork of the common Christianity of S. Paul, his correspondents, and even his opponents, with which they were so intimately acquainted as to render the numerous incidental references to it with which the Epistles abound intelligible.

Secondly. That a reconstruction of the Church took place after the Crucifixion, and that it was reconstructed on the belief that its Founder had risen from the dead.

Thirdly. That the belief originated on the spot within a few days of the Crucifixion; and the fact was openly proclaimed as the new basis of His Messiahship.

Fourthly. That the efforts of Paul and his fellow-persecutors failed to discover that this belief was the result of either delusion or imposture.

Fifthly. That the Apostolic body believed that they had two interviews with Jesus when they were assembled together, in which they saw Him alive after His Crucifixion.

Sixthly. That two of the Apostles were persuaded that they had private interviews with Him.

Seventhly. That upwards of five hundred brethren believed that they saw Him alive after His Crucifixion, when they were assembled in a body.

Eighthly. That Paul himself was firmly persuaded that he had seen the risen Jesus.

Ninthly. That the objective reality of the Resurrection was the accepted belief of the entire Christian community, including its various opposing parties; and that it was no gradual growth, but constituted the sole foundation on which the Church was built.

One point more requires notice, which is this. Do these Epistles afford evidence that the traditions of the followers of Jesus attributed to Him a superhuman character during His ministry; or, in other words, did they describe Him as a worker of miracles; or was a superhuman character ascribed to Him merely as a consequence of His Resurrection. For determining this point they furnish the following data :—

First. S. Paul attributed, at the time he wrote them, a highly superhuman character to Jesus.

Secondly. This superhuman character was not viewed by him as a consequence of His Resurrection, but as possessed by him antecedently.

Thirdly. That the incidental manner in which this character is continually and repeatedly referred to proves that the Apostle took it for granted that his correspondents, and even his opponents, likewise assigned a superhuman character of some kind to the Founder of the Church. Their Christology may not have been equally exalted with that of Paul; but it is simply incredible that the Apostle should have written as he did unless he was persuaded that his correspondents concurred with him in attributing to our Lord a superhuman character of some kind.

How, then, stands the case? S. Paul, let it be observed, started as a strictly monotheistic Jew. By such a Jew the superhuman character which he has attributed to Jesus would have been pronounced in the highest degree blasphemous. Is it, then, at all credible that a monotheistic Jew, endowed with the mental powers of the Apostle, should have attributed a character so highly superhuman to one who had been crucified within his own recollection, if there was nothing in the actions of His earthly life differing in character from those of an eminent Rabbi, and that a large number of other monotheistic Jews should have united with him in doing so? Unless S. Paul's Judaising opponents agreed with him in ascribing to Jesus some kind of superhuman character, they would have interrupted the reading of his Epistles in the church with cries of blasphemy; and considering the general caution he displays in dealing with opponents, it is incredible that he would have exposed himself to this danger at almost every turn.

From all this it follows, that the account of our Lord's actions current in the Church during this period of time, must have attributed to Him a superhuman character, for all practical purposes similar to that depicted in the Synoptics, or, to speak more accurately, it must have closely approximated to the delineation of it in the Fourth Gospel. But for a full

statement of this, and the rest of the Pauline argument, we may refer again to the *Bampton Lectures* of 1877.

'S. R.' is fully aware of the value of the Pauline testimony, and has done his best to weaken its force ; for discredit it he cannot. His reasonings here are thoroughly partial, without the smallest attempt to balance evidence—a character which must be attributed to large portions of his work. They consist in carefully stating all that is probable, or even possible, on his own side of the question, and in keeping in the background all the great points of evidence which have been adduced by those who take the contrary view. Space will only allow two illustrations of his mode of reasoning. The object of 'S. R.' is to discredit S. Paul's testimony on the ground that he did not trouble himself to investigate facts. He cites the following words of the Apostle : 'Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter, and abode with him fifteen days ; but other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother. . . . Then after fourteen years, I went up to Jerusalem'—(Gal. i. 16, 18, 21.) His reasoning on them, as given in vol. iii. p. 494, is as follows :—

'On which occasion we know his business was not of a nature to allow us to suppose that he obtained much information regarding the Resurrection. Now, we may ask, is there that thirst for information regarding the facts and doctrines of Christianity displayed here, which entitles us to suppose that Paul eagerly and minutely investigated the evidence for them? We think not. Paul made up his mind in his own way ; and having waited three years without asking a question, it is not probable that the questions that he then asked were of a searching nature. The protest that he saw none of the Apostles may prove his independence ; but it certainly does not show his anxiety for information. . . . We should not, however, be justified in affirming that the conversation between the two great Apostles never turned on the subject of the Resurrection ; but we think that it is obvious that Paul's visit was not in the least one of investigation.'

It is perfectly true that S. Paul assigns other reasons for his two visits than a set purpose of investigating the facts of Christianity. He had had ample opportunities of doing this, when a persecutor, and his attempt to destroy the Church rendered it absolutely incumbent on him to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the important points of the controversy. All this, however, 'S. R.' leaves entirely unnoticed, and he has so put the case, by the aid of a set of probabilities and innuendoes, as to produce the impression on the reader's mind, that S. Paul was absolutely careless about



ascertaining the truth of facts, and this is insinuated throughout his entire argument. The answer to this shall be brief. The idea that Paul, once the persecutor, now become an ardent believer in the Resurrection, and inflamed with the deepest love for his risen Master, during a visit to Peter of fifteen days' duration, only three years after his conversion, did not earnestly converse with him about his alleged interviews with Jesus, is to invite us to accept as true a thing which contradicts the deepest impulses of the human mind, and is utterly inconsistent with the profound earnestness of his character. But further, S. Paul informs us (in 1 Cor. xv. 5), that our Lord made an appearance to Peter separately from the other Apostles. The only other authority for this fact is an indirect reference to it in the third Gospel. What can be more probable than that Paul learned this incident from the lips of Peter himself? He also tells us of a separate appearance made to James. What more likely than that he heard it from James himself, with whom he tells us he had interviews, for of this appearance S. Paul is our sole informant? The truth is, that if the writers of the New Testament had complied with all the requisitions made on them by 'S. R.,' the Epistles would have been expanded into volumes, and the whole book would have approached the size of the *Mishna*.

No less than 320 pages of the third volume are directed to a minute criticism of the Acts of the Apostles, for the purpose of proving that scarcely an incident recorded in its pages rests on an historical foundation. As a specimen of the kind of reasoning which satisfies 'S. R.,' the following very singular passage may be quoted from vol. iii. p. 81. He is labouring to prove that none of the discourses in the Acts are genuine; but that all were composed by the author:—

'The favourite formula with which all the speeches open is "Men (and) Brethren" (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* or *ἄνδρες*), united with some other term, as "Men (and) Israelites" (*ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται*), or simply *ἄνδρες* without addition. The words *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* occur no less than thirteen times. . . . The angels at the Ascension address the disciples as "Men (and) Galileans" (*ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*). Peter makes use of *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται* twice, and it is likewise employed by Paul, by Gamaliel, and by the Jews of Asia. Peter addresses those assembled at the Pentecost as *ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι*. Paul opens his Athenian speech with *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, and the town clerk begins his short appeal to the craftsmen at Ephesus, *ἄνδρες Ἐφεσίοι*. The simple *ἄνδρες* is used indifferently by different persons. There can be no doubt that the common use of these expressions by all the speakers in the Acts betrays the hand of the same composer throughout.'

But *can* there be no reasonable doubt on this point?

How stand the facts? The term *ἄνδρες*, when addressed to a Greek audience, conveyed much the same idea as the word 'gentlemen' does to an English one; and was in equally general use. As an illustration of this, the satirist Lucian, with bitter irony, represents Jupiter as addressing an assembly of the gods with the words *ὦ ἄνδρες θεοί* (literally, men gods, but really meaning sirs, or gentlemen gods). *Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* was the term habitually used by an Athenian orator when he addressed a public assembly of the citizens. *Ἄνδρες Εφεσίοι* would be no less appropriate at Ephesus; and *ἄνδρες*, with the addition of the name of the people of the place, at any other city. To this an exception must be made. It would have been incorrect if placed in the mouth of a Roman speaker in an address professing to have been delivered to a body of assembled citizens. Thus we require no other reason for being assured that the speech of Antonius in the play of *Julius Caesar* is the composition of Shakspeare, and not of Antonius, than the fact that the latter is made to address a body of Roman citizens with the words, 'Friends, Romans, countrymen.' Again, Jews and Christians viewed one another as brethren; therefore the words *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*, either by themselves, or with additions, are exactly the expressions which a Jewish or Christian speaker would naturally employ. The inference, therefore, which the use of these terms suggests may not inaptly be expressed in 'S. R.'s own words slightly altered: 'There can be no doubt that the common use of these expressions by all the speakers of the Acts affords a strong indication that the author of the work has incorporated many of their real utterances into these discourses.' Equally valid with the reasoning of 'S. R.' would it be to argue, that because the addresses of English public speakers for the most part commence with the words Sir, or Gentlemen, 'that this betrays the hand of the same composer throughout.' Probably 'S. R.' has a little private theory of his own, that Lucian, to whom the word *ἄνδρες* must have been an extremely favourite expression, as is proved by his putting such words as *ὦ ἄνδρες θεοί* into the mouth of Jupiter, when addressing an assembly of gods, assisted the author of the Acts in the composition of the discourses.

The few remaining remarks must be on the subject of the Resurrection. 'S. R.'s mode of treating this subject need not detain us long. While he does his utmost to detract from the value of the testimony to its truth which is afforded by the Pauline Epistles, he passes over without notice those points which render their testimony in an historical point of

view of pre-eminent value, and which are fully set forth in the *Bampton Lectures* already referred to. But after all his reasonings, 'S. R.' apparently admits the only point, the proof of which is absolutely necessary to the validity of the Christian argument, viz., that the belief in the Resurrection was general among the followers of Jesus, and that the Church was reconstructed after His crucifixion on the basis of His supposed resurrection. Now, it cannot be denied that Christianity and the Society in which it has been embodied have formed the mightiest force which has acted on civilised man during eighteen centuries of history, and that the Church came into existence at a well-known period of time. This Society has always affirmed that it was reconstructed in the firm persuasion of His followers that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. If that belief is true, it furnishes a rational account of the origin of the Church, and the mighty influence which has been exerted by the Galilean peasant on the history of the past which satisfies the demands of a sound philosophy. But, if the Founder of the Church never rose from the dead, then this great institution, and the influence which its Founder, Jesus Christ, has exerted on the long course of history, have been based on the delusions of a body of credulous fanatics, who mistook a set of visionary appearances and conversations with the departed Jesus, the creations of their own distempered imaginations, for objective facts, even while His body was at hand corrupting in its grave; and, in the firm conviction that this delusion was a reality, proceeded to reconstruct the Church in the face of the opposition of a hostile world. If, therefore, it is affirmed that the belief in the Resurrection was a delusion, those who affirm it are bound to offer an explanation of the great facts of history which shall be consistent with such a theory; to prove such a delusion to be consistent with the facts of human nature; and to explain how it has come to pass that a baseless delusion has proved the mightiest moral and spiritual power which has ever been brought to bear on the human mind.

On this point 'S. R.' has little fresh to offer. He falls back on the theory of visions as affording a philosophical explanation of the belief in the Resurrection. This theory, as has been hinted above, affirms that the credulous, superstitious, and enthusiastic followers of Jesus took to seeing visions of their departed Master, in which they fancied that they saw Him alive, and held conversations with Him after His crucifixion, and that they mistook these for objective realities, and not only so, but in the fulness of their convictions,

and in the face of every opposition, that they proceeded to lay deep the foundations of that great institution which has indelibly stamped its impress on the forms of thought, the customs, the arts, the legislation, in a word, on the entire civilisation of all the progressive nations of mankind. This theory our author is ready to supplement, if necessary, by the additional one, that Jesus did not die from the effects of the Crucifixion, but that He recovered, and retired from the public view; and that His credulous followers, aided by a set of visions, mistook this for a resurrection and an ascension into heaven. Both these theories, as has been pointed out elsewhere, if they are veritable explanations of the historic facts, only succeed in substituting a different set of miraculous occurrences in the place of those recorded in the Gospels.

The only novelty in 'S. R.'s' treatment of this subject is the use which he makes of the three principles laid down by Dr. Carpenter in his work on Mental Psychology, viz. 'Prepossession, Fixed Idea, and Expectancy,' as affording a rational account of the origin of numerous delusions, and among them those of modern spiritualism. 'S. R.' is of opinion that these three principles will afford considerable assistance in accounting for the delusions on the part of the followers of Jesus, to which reference has been already made. He is probably not aware that Dr. Carpenter, about a year and a half since, read a paper entitled *The Fallacies of Testimony* before a considerable body of clergy assembled at Sion College, which he afterwards published as an article in the *Contemporary Review*. In this paper Dr. Carpenter propounds these and other similar principles as affording a philosophical account of the origin of the belief in the miracles which are recorded in both the Old and the New Testaments; but it should be added that in the discussion which followed Dr. Carpenter was understood to admit that these three principles were inadequate to explain the origin of the belief in the Resurrection. If so, we lament that this admission was not repeated in the article in the *Contemporary*; for it is certain that, as far as the ordinary reader is concerned, it can produce no other impression than that the writer regards belief in the Resurrection as one which can be explained by the aid of the three principles in question.

But whatever Dr. Carpenter's views may be on this subject, it is evident, of the origin of whatever delusions these three principles may form a philosophical explanation, they utterly fail to account for the belief in the Resurrection. The prepossessions of the followers of Jesus were, no doubt, great and

many ; but not one of them suggested a vision of a man who had been crucified as an impostor for claiming to be the Messiah risen from the dead, and of the erection of a new Messianic kingdom on its basis. Such as they had would have all tended in the contrary direction. So, likewise, whatever 'fixed ideas' they might have possessed, if they produced visions at all, they would have been of the very opposite character to those which this theory presupposes, for fixed ideas are necessarily in the highest degree conservative of the past. As to 'expectancy,' nothing can be more certain than that of a resurrection they had none ; for, even if, as 'S. R.' endeavours to prove, a belief in a resurrection had become a popular tenet (which I greatly doubt), there was nothing in the past history of the Jewish people which would suggest the expectation that God would vindicate the cause of a murdered prophet by raising him from the dead. The only ground on which a strong expectancy of a resurrection could have possessed the disciples would have been the fact that our Lord not only predicted His own death, but His resurrection also. This our Gospels tell us that He did in terms most express and definite ; but as this would involve the presence in Him of a superhuman foresight, unbelievers decline to accept their statements on this point as historical. The utmost, therefore, that can be suggested is, that He may have thrown out some vague hopes that God would vindicate His cause after the termination of His earthly life, and that He should live again in it. But vague hopes of this kind could not have produced such a state of expectancy in minds utterly depressed by the events of the Crucifixion, as to cause them to see visions of Him risen from the dead, to mistake them for realities, and on the strength of these delusions to engage in the work of reconstructing the Church on the new basis of a crucified Messiah. It follows, therefore, that neither these nor any other principles, laid down by Dr. Carpenter, afford us the smallest aid in accounting for the unquestionable historic facts which form the foundation on which the Christian Church was erected, and equally impotent are they to explain the subsequent facts of history. If the theory of visions and that which has been invented to supplement it, viz. that the followers of Jesus, in the depth of their credulity, mistook His gradual recovery from the wounds which were inflicted in His crucifixion for a resurrection (how He managed to escape alive out of the hands of His enemies we are not informed, but we must assume that He did so, or the theory collapses), are the true account of the actual facts, then we

must assume a number of events to have happened which are as unaccountable as the result of those forces which energise in the moral and spiritual worlds, as the Resurrection itself is unaccountable as the result of those which energise in the material world. All that we get is the substitution of one class of miracles for another, with this additional disadvantage, that the substituted ones, if real, prove that a power which has exerted a mightier influence on mankind for good than the labours of the wisest and the best, rests on zero for its foundation, or, to speak more truly, on the vices of credulity, superstition, and fanaticism, in their most extreme form.

The state, therefore, of the case stands thus. The Christian Church has always given an account of its origin, which, if true, forms an explanation of it, and of the events of history, which fully satisfies our reason, i.e., the cause assigned is adequate to the effect. Unbelief, on the other hand, propounds a set of causes which break down, not only when the tests of a sound philosophy are applied to them, but even those of common sense. The alternative is before us. The Resurrection is either a fact or a fiction. If the latter, the theories above referred to are the only solutions which unbelief has to propound of the historic facts. What, then, is the course which reason demands? Only one answer can fairly be given—to accept the adequate cause as the true one, and to reject the inadequate ones as mere creations of the imagination of those who propound them.

---

#### ART. III.—THE *ICON BASILIKÈ*.

1. *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè.'* By the REV. C. H. R. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London, 1824, &c.)
2. *The 'Icon Basilikè.'* 1648 edition.
3. *A True Account of the 'Icon Basilikè.'* By DR. WALKER. *State Tracts, William III.*

IT was stated in the article upon the *Personal Government of Charles I.* which recently appeared in this Review, that the 'enduring importance of this reign' still affords sufficient excuse for the renewed investigation of any portion of it, even though the subject has been already treated by the greatest writers of English history.



In accordance with this opinion, we now venture to call attention to one of the most singular features of that eventful period, that, namely, of the influence of the *Icon Basilikè*.

The question as to the authorship of the *Icon Basilikè* is one more closely personal in its relation to the King than even the nine years of his government to which we have alluded, and yet it exercised a wide and general influence over the kingdom at large.

This influence, which made itself felt in the country and prevailed, even at the worst moment of her civil tumult, has ever since occupied more or less the attention of her historians. They have written upon it, to borrow once more the words of Mr. Gardner's reviewer, either as Whigs or Tories, according to their strong bias for or against the King. And now at the present moment, if the question were once more raised, 'Who wrote the *Icon Basilikè*?' we should find opinions divided into distinct sections. The Royalists would claim the right of authorship for the King on every ground. In whatever light they view the book, whether as a contemporary historical record, a rare literary treasure, or an exact representation of the King's mind and character, it would be scarcely possible to over-estimate the value of such an autobiography to their cause.

On each and all of these grounds the anti-Royalists endeavour to destroy the royal claim to the work; yet, if we trace the controversy from its very beginning, we shall find that upon this point the King's antagonists have materially shifted their position in the argument since the day of the publication of the first *Icon Basilikè*. All agree in fixing that date as close as possible to that of the King's murder. A copy of the first edition is still extant in the British Museum, among the collection which goes by the name of the 'King's Pamphlets,' and it contains an MS. memorandum on the title-page, indicating the day of publication, or rather the day when the book first came into the collector's hands, bearing the date February 9 (1648). But we have the history of an earlier copy than this—a copy which was published on January 31, 1648, the day after the King's murder, and which was bought for ten shillings by Mr. John Wilson, barrister-at-law, author of the *Vindication of Icon Basilikè against Milton*.<sup>1</sup> 'This further I speak of my own knowledge,' says the author: 'the very next morning after that horrible act I saw one of them and read part of it under the title of *Icon Basilikè*, which it now bears.'

<sup>1</sup> *Vindiciæ Carolinæ*, 1692, p. 10.

Cromwell and his Council of State found that their interest required that the work should as speedily as possible be brought into disrepute. They fixed upon Milton to perform this office for them. The King's book was entitled the *Royal Image*, so Milton called his reply the *Image-Breaker*. It was first printed in 1649, within about eight months of the death of the King, and again in the following year. Every admirer of Milton must regret that he was the author of that work; the errors of argument, the imperfect knowledge which he displays of his subject, the supreme bad taste of insulting the fallen and departed King, have not even the excuse that they are the ill-considered outburst of spontaneous feeling. Milton tells us he took it upon him as 'a work assigned, rather than by him chosen or affected;' and, in servile obedience to Cromwell, he executes his unworthy task. It was not likely that he would neglect the opportunity of casting a doubt upon the authorship of the book. But here he signally fails; the one paragraph which suggests the idea of an author other than the King is contradicted not only by the whole line of argument, which depends upon the book being written by the royal hand, but by such expressions as 'the King's own words,' 'own testimony,' 'own rule,' 'his aphorism,' which are freely used in this treatise.

Milton's argument was a failure, although it was supported by a formal pamphlet adopting his insinuation and fastening the authorship of the book upon either Dr. Hammond or Dr. Harris. The only result of this pamphlet was to elicit such a conclusive answer, backed by proofs, from the Royalist side,<sup>1</sup> that the assertions with regard to these two chaplains of the Household were abandoned, never to be revived. One of the Royalist writers at this the earliest period of the controversy argues thus:—

'It is impossible but that the King was admirably good if we read him in that book; therefore there is a necessity that the book should be none of his. What is the use of argument when there is a necessity? Or the author might have informed himself of divers who have seen the original copy, manuscibed by the King himself. He might have seen it himself for the asking. He might have heard thousands who would have taken their oaths upon it, thousands who would have justified it with their lives. . . . The King's style was as easy to be known from other styles as was his face from other faces, it being impossible that either face or style should counterfeit the majesty of either. But necessity must be obeyed.'

We have already seen that Cromwell and his Council

<sup>1</sup> *The Princely Pelican*, 1649.

were fully aware of this 'necessity.' Argument, the means they had first employed to turn the stream of popular opinion into another channel, having failed, they now resorted to the more violent measures of threats, bribes, and imprisonment. There was 'a great deal of' search after the printing presses. Richard Royston, the King's printer, was summoned by Bradshaw to Whitehall,

'where they examined him about the printing of the said book, promising him great rewards if he would deny that, tho' printed, it was the King's, and threatening him with great severity if he owned it to be the said King's, but he constantly affirmed that he printed it by his Majestie's special order about 14. . . . after the Martyrdome of his glorious Majestie; so that neither their promises of reward nor their threatening of punishment prevailed with him; wherefore they immediately kept him a prisoner under a messenger's hand about a fortnight.'

After that time they sent for William Levett, page to the late King, and writer of the letter just quoted, and 'upon examination of mee,' the narrative continues, 'Bradshaw bee convinced that the saide booke was his Majestie's own, replied, "Who could think that so wicked a man could writ so good a booke?"'<sup>1</sup>

This was the opinion of the president of the regicide tribunal; and, to make the evidence on that side complete, we have on record Cromwell's own statement concerning the book. 'Madam,' he said to Lady Winwood, taking up the *Icon Basilike*, which lay on her table, 'I see you have Charles Stuart's book.' She replied, 'My Lord, do you believe the late King to be the author of it?' To which he answered, 'Yes, most certainly, for he was the greatest hypocrite in the world.'<sup>2</sup>

We find the corroboration of this opinion in the Orders in Council issued at this time:—

'1651, May 20.—Ordered—That Mr. Dury do proceed in the translating of Mr. Milton's Book, written in answer to the *late King's Book*, and that it be left to Mr. Frost to give him such reward for his pains as he shall think fit.'

'1652, November 15.—Ordered—That it be referred to Mr. Thurloe to consider of a fit reward to be given to Mr. Dury for his pains in

<sup>1</sup> This autograph letter has been placed in the hands of the writer of this essay. The MS. is endorsed, 'Mr. Richard Royston's relation to mee for y<sup>e</sup> printing K. C. his book, Nov. 18, 1684,' and is now in the possession of Col. Richard Levett, of Milford Hall, Stafford, a lineal descendant of the King's page.

<sup>2</sup> Wagstaffe's *Vindication of the Royal Martyr*, p. 101.

translating into French the book written by Mr. Milton in answer to that of the late King, entitled "His Meditations."<sup>1</sup>

Milton followed the new lead, and in two pamphlets—(1) *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, (2) *A Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Commonwealth*—published at this time, refers to the *Icon Basilikè* as the King's work, and quotes a passage from it in italics as the last charge of Charles to his son. The leading members of the Council were Cromwell, Bradshaw, Whitelocke, Vane, Harrington, Mildmay, and they came to the conclusion that it was the King's work, and have themselves placed this on record, after the failure of their efforts either to convict the volume of forgery or to arrest its sale.

Such, then, was the result of the first controversy respecting the *Icon Basilikè*. We have the deliberate opinion of the King's enemies that the book was written by the 'late King,' and that opinion is expressed on several occasions within a few months of the first publication of the work. Their endeavour to deprive the King of the credit of the composition had only served to bring to light convincing proofs in favour of the royal authorship, and had thus strengthened, instead of weakening, the hold which the book had already obtained over the popular mind. They found themselves compelled to change their tactics; and, taking refuge in the exact opposite of their former position, they now brought their charge against the King because he *had* written a 'book which showed his theatrical piety and high dissimulation, a "Black Book," writ on purpose to abuse the people into credulity and favour of his actions, and to poison them after his death.'

The controversy was not revived during the remainder of Cromwell's Protectorate. He died in 1659. The first year of the Restoration is marked by the issue of the royal letters patent of King Charles II. granting to Richard Royston the sole privilege of printing the works of King Charles I., 'as a reward for his fidelity in publishing many messages and papers of our said blessed father, especially those most excellent discourses and soliloquies by the name of *Icon Basilikè*,' &c. &c. Nov. 29, 1660.

Yet, although not generally known till some time afterwards, at the very period of the issue of these letters patent by Charles II. his father's claim to the authorship of the book was again being called in question—not openly, but secretly, not by the late King's enemies, but by his pretended friend.

<sup>1</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè,'* pp. 199, 200.

The nature of this attack is at once so audacious and so subtle that more than one historian has yielded to its force and has in turn made use of the same weapon to weaken, if not altogether to destroy, the confidence of posterity in the royal autobiography. But Dr. Wordsworth was not so easily overcome. He grappled with the difficulty in an exhaustive collection of tracts on the subject; he stated with candour every circumstance which may be urged in favour of the rival claim, compared the evidence, and drew his own conclusion. We will not trespass on the patience of the reader by following the indefatigable writer through the maze of contemporary controversy, but will endeavour to give a brief summary of those points upon which the real issue of the question may be said to depend.

The restoration of the episcopate, the best means of supplying the gaps which had occurred since the abolition of the order by the Parliament of 1646, was the first and anxious care of Sir Edward Hyde, even before the return of Charles II. to England. Among the divines selected to fill the vacant sees was Dr. Gauden, Dean and Rector of Bocking, consecrated Bishop of Exeter on December 2, 1660, enthroned in his cathedral on the 11th of that month. Dissatisfied with the poverty of his see, ten days have scarcely elapsed since his enthronement when the Bishop makes a series of complaints to his patron, and first in vague hints, afterwards in distinct language, presses upon the notice of the Lord Chancellor his special claim to a richer and better preferment. That special claim he avers to be the authorship of the *Icon Basilikè*. The documents in which the evidence of this startling statement is to be found are derived from three sources. They consist of Gauden's letters to the Lord Chancellor in the Clarendon Papers at Oxford,<sup>1</sup> of the letters of the same person and his widow to the Earl of Bristol, from the Gibson Papers (formerly Archbishop Tennison's) in the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth, and lastly of the letters and other papers of Gauden, Mrs. Gauden, the Lord Chancellor, Sir Edward Nicholas, &c., now the property of Mr. Cornthwaite.<sup>2</sup> First, with regard to Gauden's own letters, Dr. Wordsworth, in one of the careful notes with which his book is enriched, gives us the exact description of them.

'Of these letters the Rev. Dr. Bandinel, in a letter dated "Bodleian Library, May 9, 1825," informs me, "I have them all (six in num-

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iii., Appendix, pp. xxvi.-vii.

<sup>2</sup> Documentary Supplement to *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, pp. 3, 4.

ber) now before me. They are all originals. All are directed to the Lord High Chancellor. All have been sealed—the five first with wax—and the impression a private, not the episcopal seal. All were undoubtedly received by Clarendon, as the first five are endorsed by himself. The last, sealed with a wafer, is endorsed by Lord Cornbury. The endorsements on the respective letters are :— (1) Bpp. of Exitter, Dec. 21; (2) *ibid.*, Dec. 26; (3) *ibid.*, Jan. 21; (4) *ibid.*, Feb. 25 (it should be Jan.); (5) *ibid.*, Feb. 20 (these five by Lord Clarendon); (6) *ibid.*, Mar. 6, 1660 (by Lord Cornbury). On the back of the first letter some person who was concerned in editing the State Papers (for I trace the handwriting, and I think it to be Scrope) has written, 'This bishop was the author of *Eikon Basilikè*,' after which some other person has written in stronger characters, 'NO.' After the dates of the endorsements on the first five there is written by a later hand, certainly not Lord Clarendon's, '1660.' The last is full-dated by Lord Cornbury."<sup>1</sup>

Letter I., Dec. 21, 1660, complains bitterly of the disadvantages of his new preferment, the poverty of the see, its distance from his friends; he 'refuses to beare with patience such a ruine after the service he has done the Royal Family, and his wife is too conscious of this service to bear with any temper the streights to which she sees herself and her children exposed.'

Letter II., Dec. 26, 1660, renews these laments, describes how yesterday he spent the saddest Christmas Day 'that ever I did keep in my life; that am come to an high rack and empty manger,' again hints at the signal service he has done the Royal Family, and is signed, 'The sad Bishop of Exeter.'

Letter III. is a reply to one from the Lord Chancellor, in which the Lord Chancellor protests his ignorance of any extraordinary or secret service. Gauden in this letter drops all hints and states plainly in what his great 'arcanum,' as he calls it, consists.

'Nor doe I doubt but I shall, by your Lordship's favour, find the fruits as to something extraordinary, since the service was soe; not as to what was known to the world under my name, in order to vindicate the Crown and Church, but what goes under the late blessed King's name, the *εικὼν* or portraiture of hys Majesty in his solitude and sufferings. This booke and figure was wholly and only my invention, making, and designe, in order to vindicate the King's wisdom, honor, and piety. My wife, indeed, was conscious to it, and had a hand in disguising the letters of that copy which I sent to the King in the Isle of Wight, by favour of the late Marquise of Hartford, which was delivered to the King by the now Bishop of Win-

<sup>1</sup> Documentary Supplement to *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, p. 8.



chester. Hys Majesty graciously accepted, owned, and adopted it as his sense and genius, not only with great approbation, but admiration ; hee kept it by him ; and though his cruel murderers went on to perfect hys martyrdome, yet God preserved and prospered this book, to revive hys honour and redeeme hys Majesty's name from that grave of contempt, abhorrence, and infamy in which they aymed to bury him, &c. &c. . . . I did lately present my fayth in it [the book] to the Duke of York, and by him to the King. Both of them were pleased to give me credit and owne it as a rare service in those horrors of times. True I played this best card in my hand something too late, else I might have sped as well as Dr. Reynolds and some others ; but I did not lay it as a ground of ambition, nor use it as a ladder. Thinking myself secure in the just value of Dr. Morley, who I was sure knew it, and told mee your Lordship did so too,' &c.

We must note, in passing, that in this letter Gauden says he has already acquainted the King and the Duke of York with his secret, and here, by a comparison of dates, we find that this communication was made to the King between Nov. 3 and 7, 1660. This matter about the date has an important bearing on the question of the credence given by the King to Gauden's claim, for before the month was out—i.e. on the 29th—royal letters patent were granted to Richard Royston for the sole printing of the late King's works, and *particularly the Icon Basilike*.

Letters IV. (Jan. 25), V. (Feb. 20), VI. (Mar. 6), follow the letter which contained the vital secret, without any answer being vouchsafed to the importunate Bishop, who renews in each of them his complaints and lamentations over the poverty of his see. At length, on March 13, two months having elapsed, the Lord Chancellor breaks silence. He begins by assuring his correspondent that all his letters make a deep impression upon him, and ends with these lines :—

'The particular which you often renewed I doe confesse was imparted to me under secresy, and of which I did not take myself to be at liberty to take notice ; and truly when it ceases to be a secret I know nobody will be glad of it but Mr. Milton. I have very often wished that I had never been trusted with it. My Lord, I have nothing to enlarge, all I have to say being fitter for a conference than a letter, and I hope shortly to see you.'<sup>1</sup>

At the latter end of the month Gauden comes to London. There is no evidence to show whether or not he had the promised conference with Clarendon ; but in the following December he resumes his correspondence. The Bishop of Winchester is ill, and Gauden, with an eye to succeeding

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 22.

him, again urges his claim; but there is no answer to this letter from the Lord Chancellor. Then we have letters of the same kind to the Duke of York (Jan. 17, 1662) and to the King;—letters containing a distinct falsehood, for he says to the King, 'I doe not need, soe I cannot well have any other intercessor than your own royal favour, and his Highness the Duke of York, to whose breast only have I communicated so important a secret'—whereas Letter III. shows that he had also confided it to Lord Clarendon. There is no answer to this letter extant among the papers.

Next in order come Gauden's letters to the Earl of Bristol. They are seven in number, bearing dates March 20, 26, 27, 31, May 1, July 9, July 9, 1662. They are characterised by a marked servility, coupled with innuendoes against his former patron, then on the verge of his disgrace at Court, and of whom Lord Bristol was known to be the bitter antagonist. Gauden accidentally discovers that his new correspondent is acquainted with his '*arcanum*,' and from that moment, in the hope of obtaining the see of Winchester, he ceases not to beset him with the same importunities with which he had pestered Lord Clarendon. More especially when the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Duppa) leaves 'all humane affairs' then Gauden's letters pour in; but although he does not obtain the see he desires, he is still his Lordship's 'humble, thankful servant.' On May 23 Gauden is appointed to Worcester, vacated by Morley's promotion to Winchester. In the last three letters, May 1 and two of July 9 (1662), there is only one allusion to the '*arcanum*.' On September 20 Gauden died, aged 57, having only occupied his new see four months.

This is Gauden's own story, and at first sight it is startling enough. The next piece of direct evidence is that of Gauden's wife. Shortly after the death of her husband she addresses a letter to Lord Bristol, explaining how her husband, when he was dying, tried to write to him, but was unable to do so. She then enters upon the same subject, 'the secret of which his Lordship was aware; her confidence in his compassion, that he will exert himself to assist her,' &c., in obtaining for her the remission of certain claims in respect of her late husband's tenure of the See of Worcester. No answer is to be found to this letter, and we know that the boon sought was not granted. In 1671 Mrs. Gauden also died. She has left behind her a narrative in two parts, which we have before us. It is comprised in a paper written shortly after the death of her husband in 1662. It was not publicly known till 1693, when an abstract was given of it in

a pamphlet bearing title *Truth Brought to Light, &c.*, which gives the account of the papers from which it was taken—*A Summary Account of some Papers relating to the 'Icon Basilikè,' or Portraictur of King Charles I.*, now in the hands of Mr. Arthur North, living at Tower Hill, London—and in 1699 it was published by Mr. Toland in his *Amyntor*.

Mr. North and Mr. C. Gauden, son of the Bishop, married two sisters. At the death of Mr. C. Gauden these papers were bequeathed to his wife. Mr. North, the brother-in-law, having occasion to search among them, found those relating to the *Icon Basilikè* carefully tied up together. The papers are as follows:—(1) Letter from Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, Jan. 1660, to Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter, to acquaint him that his Majesty had received his letter, that he had him in his thoughts, and that he should not long have cause to complain of his removal from Bocking. (2) A copy of the letter of the Bishop to Lord Chancellor Hyde, Dec. 28, 1661 (already quoted). (3) Copy of the Bishop's letter to the Duke of York, Jan. 17, 1661. (4) An original letter from the Lord Chancellor Hyde to the Bishop of Exeter (the letter from which a portion has been quoted). (5) Mrs. Gauden's letter, after the death of her husband, to her son John, speaking of the book commonly called the King's. She calls it the 'Jewel,' and says her husband hoped to make a fortune by it. (6) A long narrative in Mrs. Gauden's handwriting, showing that her husband wrote the book. This narrative by Mrs. Gauden sets forth the motive of her husband in writing this book—namely, that he understood that Cromwell and others in the army had obtained the esteem of the people by their great parts and piety, that it was their main design to eclipse his Majesty and give a false representation of him to the world, that he (Dr. Gauden), to do his Majesty right, did pen that book by name the King's book, intending to call it *Suspiria Regalia*, and the design of the book was to give such a character of his Majesty to the world as his just worth, extreme merit, and admirable endowments deserved. It was shown to Lord Capel, who highly approved of it, but thought it not fit to publish it without his Majesty's approbation; and it was at that time impossible to speak to his Majesty, because of the strict guard which they kept about him. The Newport Treaty took place immediately after this. My Lord Marquis Hertford was appointed to attend upon the King there. Dr. Gauden went to him, gave the MS. into his hand, of which he said he was the author, to be delivered by him to the King in the Isle of Wight. Upon the return of Lord

Hertford from the Isle of Wight, Dr. Gauden went to him to ask the fate of his MS. Lord Hertford replied that his Majesty had had some of those essays read to him by Bishop Duppa, that he did exceedingly approve of them, and asked whether they could not be put out in some other name. The Bishop replied that the design was that the world should take the book to be his Majesty's; whereupon his Majesty desired time to consider of it.

'This,' says my Lord, 'is all the account I can give of it. What is become of the MS. I know not, and what will become of his Majesty God knows.' Dr. Gauden consulted with Lord Hertford what was best to be done, and, says Mrs. Gauden, 'my Lord bade my husband do what he would, in regard the case was desperate.' Dr. Gauden resolved to print it with all speed, having a duplicate copy of the one he had sent to King Charles. The narrative continues:—

'Now, the instrument which my husband employed to get it printed was one Mr. Symmonds, a divine and a great sufferer for his Majesty, and he got one Mr. Royston to print it, which Royston never knew anything but that it was his Majesty's own penning. My husband did then alter the title of it, and called it *Icon Basilikè*.'

This is the substance of Mrs. Gauden's narrative. Although curious and circumstantial, it does not add in reality to the importance of Dr. Gauden's own statement, with the exception of two considerable names, those of Lord Capel and Archbishop Sheldon, persons whom Mrs. Gauden declares to have been privy to the forgery of the book. Sheldon, she affirms, 'was not ignorant that her husband was the only author of the *Icon*.' But this assertion rests on her bare statement; not one word can be produced on the part of the Archbishop to confirm it. To judge by his conduct as represented by Mrs. Gauden, it does not appear that he either believed in Gauden's claim or feared the consequences of its being made public. 'Whatever I pleaded to my Lord' (Archbishop Sheldon), 'it was to no purpose, his Lordship being resolved *not* to do it for me.' This alone is suggestive; but when we go one step higher and ask what was the opinion of Archbishop Juxon, Sheldon's immediate predecessor, we arrive at definite evidence which goes far to reduce the whole question to a balance between the personal veracity of the saintly Archbishop and Dr. Gauden. It is contained in the following autograph of the Earl of Winchelsea:—

'Winchelsea, August 12, 1722.—I do affirm that in the year 1688 Mrs. Mompesson, wife of Thomas Mompesson, Esq., of Brouham, in

Somersetshire, told me and my wife that Archbishop Juxon assured her that, to his certain knowledge, the *Icon Basilikè* was all composed and written by King Charles the First.'

As to Lord Capel, by her own showing it is impossible that he could have been consulted at the time she indicates concerning the manuscript. 'Immediately after this' (*i.e.* immediately after consulting him) 'was the Treaty of Newport,' &c. Now, at that time Lord Capel was a close prisoner at Windsor, having been captured three months previously, at the surrender of Colchester. Lastly, both these witnesses were dead at the time of the publication of the narrative, and in neither case does their supposed testimony rest on anything but Mrs. Gauden's statement.

We must also notice the last paper contained in the roll of articles to which Mrs. Gauden's narrative belongs. This paper bears on one side the list of the documents; on the reverse side we find a very significant memorandum. We do not know by whom or when this memorandum was made, but we gather from it that it must have been subsequent to Mr. Wagstaffe's earliest publications on the subject of the *Icon Basilikè* in 1693-4.

'The whole document,' says Dr. Wordsworth, 'denotes a person standing in close relation to the property of the discovered papers, and I am inclined to think that the writer might be Charles Gauden's widow, who was known to be living when the papers were found by Mr. North at the latter end of 1692; for it seems to contain nothing short of a virtual confession that there were members of the Bishop's own family who did not believe in his claim to the authorship of the *Icon Basilikè*.'

The following is a copy of the memorandum, word for word:<sup>1</sup>—

'I set this down for a memorandum to ask Doctor Gibbons who it was y<sup>t</sup> told him in a coffe house y<sup>t</sup> my mother sold y<sup>e</sup> papers concerning the Kinge book, y<sup>t</sup> I may, when I can, have an opportunity to clear ourselves. If Mr. Wagstaf ever writes again about it he may give y<sup>e</sup> world an account y<sup>t</sup> we desire they might know y<sup>t</sup> it was don holy without our knowledg or consent, and an particular a count how they com to be exposed, &; or if it be nessesery to find out some other way to let the world know, &, y<sup>t</sup> it is my opinion y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Bish<sup>ps</sup> had y<sup>e</sup> perusing & the digesting of y<sup>m</sup> into y<sup>t</sup> order & pes<sup>ts</sup> [piecing] or y<sup>e</sup> correcting of them.'

The complaint as to the 'exposure' of the papers refers, doubtless, to the publication of Mrs. Gauden's narrative. This

<sup>1</sup> Documentary Supplement to *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, No. xxiii. p. 49.

gave rise to the second controversy concerning the *Icon Basilikè*, a controversy which raged fiercely from 1690 to 1711, fruitful in evidence to prove the royal authorship of the book. But on Dr. Gauden's side only one more piece of direct evidence was forthcoming. This was supplied by Dr. Anthony Walker, a tutor and inmate of Dr. Gauden's family, and his curate at Bocking. His statement is contained in the tract entitled *True Account of the Author of a Book entitled 'Icon Basilikè,' &c.*, published in 1692. It is an elaborate paper, occupying several chapters of a folio volume divided into three sections. The writer classes his testimony under three heads—(1) the means by which he knew what he professed to know; (2) the reasons upon which he grounds his belief; (3) the probable arguments which might be produced to support his statement. The pith of his argument lies in the second section of the paper. Here he tells us that Dr. Gauden showed him the heads of divers chapters of the *Icon Basilikè*, and acquainted him with his design of passing it upon the world as the King's book. Walker remonstrates. Gauden points to the title and says, 'No man draws his own portraiture.' He also shows him the second chapter of the book, upon the death of Lord Strafford, and explains to him that the person who counselled the King 'not to vote against his conscience' was Bishop Juxon, a fact of which Walker was ignorant. On one occasion Gauden took Walker to call on Dr. Duppa, to fetch a portion of the book then in the Bishop's care, Bishop Duppa having undertaken to write two chapters of the book, which offer Gauden accepted. Walker asked Gauden if the King had ever seen the book when it was sent to him in the Isle of Wight. Gauden replied that he *did not know*, though he had done his best to make him acquainted with it. Did King Charles II. know that Gauden was the author of the *Icon Basilikè*? Gauden could not for certain say, because the King never mentioned it to him; but the Duke of York did, acknowledging it to be a seasonable service. Mrs. Gauden and Mr. Gifford transcribed the copy which was sent to the Isle of Wight, believing it to be Dr. Gauden's composition. Walker was employed by Gauden to transmit the manuscript to Royston, which he did by a third hand, 'one Peacock' (the brother of Dr. Gauden's steward), who in his turn was instructed by what hands he should transmit it to Mr. Royston. These two narratives contain the strength of the evidence on Gauden's side; we shall find, on examining them, several discrepancies between them, discrepancies which are the less surprising, though not the less



damaging to the evidence, when we remember that Dr. Walker did not produce his testimony till nearly forty-five years after the publication of the *Icon Basilikè*. He does not tell us at what time the *Icon Basilikè* was first begun, but we know from other sources that Gauden fixes no time earlier than 1647 for the commencement of *his* work. And that would seem to be precisely the time at which Walker quitted Bocking for the service of the Earl of Warwick; so that during the supposed composition of the book by Gauden Walker can hardly have been privy to it.

In Walker's narrative Gauden is made to say that 'he did not know whether the King had ever seen his book, though he had done his best to make him acquainted with it.' How does this agree with Mrs. Gauden's statement that the King had had some of the essays read to him by Bishop Duppa, and did exceedingly approve of them? If, as Dr. Walker says, Bishop Duppa did contribute two chapters to the book, how does this agree with Gauden's positive assertion, 'The book and figure was *wholly* and *only* my invention, making, and designe'? There is one point, however, in which all three statements—Gauden's letter and the two narratives—are quite consistent. Not one can produce a word of thanks from the King to Dr. Gauden for these extraordinary efforts on his behalf. This is no small circumstance when we remember that the King never allowed the slightest service towards him to go unacknowledged, and the services tendered to him in the Isle of Wight, during his long captivity at Carisbrook, were cherished in his thoughts, as abundant evidence will testify, with feelings of special gratitude.<sup>1</sup>

Again, Walker's narrative makes Gauden to be ignorant whether King Charles II. knew of his claim. This is strange indeed, when we have already referred to the letter in which Gauden himself addresses the King in order to press his claim upon his notice. Once more Walker cites Mr. Gifford as assisting in transcribing a copy of the book. Now, not only is no corroboration from Mr. Gifford forthcoming, but we have a piece of testimony from him in which Mrs. Gauden is also concerned, which, while it transfers the weight of his authority altogether to the opposite side of the controversy, goes a long way towards discrediting Mrs. Gauden's evidence and that of Dr. Walker. There is a very singular story vouched for by Dr. Hollingworth, who, when challenged, offers to produce a living witness to testify to its truth,—

<sup>1</sup> *King Charles in the Isle of Wight.*

'to which I shall subjoin the agreeing testimony of Mr. Gifford, who lived with Dr. Gauden, and, as Dr. Walker intimates, did transcribe the book: that Mrs. Gauden told a lady of good quality that she had a great concern for the eternal state of her husband, because he pretended that he was the author of that book, when to her knowledge he never wrote it.'<sup>1</sup>

Again, a Royalist pamphlet quotes a sermon from this same Mr. Gifford, preached on January 30, urging to charity, and quoting a passage to the same effect out of the King's book, which, 'next to the Holy Scriptures, he thought to be one of the most divine books that had been written.'<sup>2</sup> We have now had before us all the direct evidence known to exist on Dr. Gauden's side—his special claim to preferment stated in distinct terms to Lord Clarendon, Mrs. Gauden's narrative, and Dr. Walker's statement. During fifteen months or more Dr. Gauden pressed this claim, first upon Clarendon, afterwards upon Lord Bristol, and died persisting in it. As to Mrs. Gauden's evidence, when we put it all together we find the statements to be of a most conflicting character. To balance the remark just quoted as to her fears for her husband's salvation, we are told in another account that after his death she resided at Gloucester; that Dr. Nicholson, at that time bishop of the see, 'understanding that Mrs. Gauden did declare that her husband wrote the King's book, did put the question to her upon her receiving the Sacrament, and she then affirmed that it was wrote by her husband.' The contemporary evidence appealed to, in order to confirm this fact, ends with the assertion, 'and the same thing is well known to several of her relations now in being.'<sup>3</sup>

Unhappily for Mrs. Gauden, there is but one testimony of these relations preserved to us, that of Mr. Charles Gauden, and it makes entirely against her:—

'A.D. 1694. The English and Dutch fleet being in Torbay, one Mr. Gauden, a nephew of Bishop Gauden's and Muster Master of the Blue Squadron, made a visit to the Rev. Walter Getsius, rector of Brixham. Mr. Getsius, on hearing his name, enquired of him whether he knew anything of what was then newly published by Dr. Walker and others concerning his uncle's writing the King's book. The gentleman seemed much troubled at the question, and said he was sorry such a false report was spread abroad. For, said he "such I know it is. *My uncle was not the author.*" He promised Mr. Getsius to tell him another time how he came to be so reputed,

<sup>1</sup> *Character of King Charles*, 1692. *Death of King Charles*, 1693. R. Hollingworth.

<sup>2</sup> *Long v. Walker*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Anti-R. pamphlet, *Ludlow no Liar*, p. 19.

deeming it not convenient to make the discovery in the company then present. The fleet soon after sailing out of the bay, Mr. Getsius saw him no more. But the truth of what is here related I have attested under his hand, in a letter dated June 23, 1699.' <sup>1</sup>

If we compare this statement with the memorandum already quoted, and supposed to be written by Charles Gauden's wife, it seems to fill up what is wanting in that curious fragment, and to leave no doubt as to the opinion of two at least of his relations that Dr. Gauden did not write the King's book. Again, we learn from Wagstaffe's *Vindication* (p. 65) that in the Life of her husband, written by her own pen, Mrs. Gauden, while mentioning every circumstance of any importance in the Bishop's life, never says a word about his having any hand in composing King Charles's *Meditations*. This Life was destroyed after her decease by her own command, so it cannot be referred to now. So many contradictory assertions cannot fail to diminish the value of Mrs. Gauden's narrative. If we examine it narrowly, we shall find that it rests chiefly upon hearsay evidence—what she had heard from her husband coupled with vague hints as to a letter 'from a very great man which will clear it up,' alluding, doubtless, to the correspondence with Lord Clarendon. It is also remarkable that whereas Dr. Gauden distinctly says 'she had a hand in disguising the letters of the copy sent to the King,' Mrs. Gauden never alludes to this once in the whole course of the narrative. It is more difficult to dispose of what we may term the indirect evidence which appears to substantiate Gauden's story—the silence of Lord Clarendon upon the subject, and the indifference displayed by Charles II. and the Duke of York in vindicating their father's right, if indeed it may not be called a half-acquiescence in the rival claim. With the exception of the one remark already mentioned in his reply to Gauden's letter, there is no word from the great Lord Chancellor to solve the mystery. But, first of all, we may urge that this silence may be taken in two ways. If we consider the integrity of the character of Clarendon, we feel that, had he been convinced of the truth of Gauden's claim, he would have felt it his duty, however painful, to communicate it to the world. It might even have been his best policy to mention it, with whatever extenuating circumstances he could suggest to soften it, rather than leave the honour of his beloved master in the unsafe keeping of a man of Gauden's discretion. Gauden cites Lord Hertford and Bishops Duppa

<sup>1</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè,'* p. 82.

and Morley to confirm his statement. It so happened that Lord Hertford died two days after the Bishop first brought forward his claim, but Morley and Duppa were alive—Morley, whose knowledge of the transaction is so repeatedly insisted upon by Gauden. If Clarendon did appeal to them, and if they did confirm Gauden's statement, it is scarcely possible but that sincerity would have compelled Clarendon to state the Bishop's claim. As, on the contrary, he persisted in silence, either no such investigation was made, or, if made, the result did not convince Clarendon. But, as a matter of fact, no evidence can be found to show that Clarendon ever did consult any of the individuals to whom Gauden refers. An investigation of the claim would naturally have followed immediately upon the receipt of the letter which announced it, but after a three-months' delay in the answer it is evident from that answer that none was made. Lord Clarendon and Gauden were to have had a conference; there is no mention of such conference having taken place, still less what was the result of it. If the meeting had taken place, and Clarendon had really been satisfied that Gauden's claim was just, it is impossible but that some boast or hint of this would have appeared afterwards in Gauden's letters; but his subsequent line of conduct leads us to exactly the opposite conclusion. There is no symptom of Lord Clarendon being so alarmed by this mighty secret as to wish to purchase Gauden's silence at any price. On the contrary, the Bishop, becoming convinced that his interests were not safe in the Lord Chancellor's hands, seeks *another patron* in the Earl of Bristol, and himself for the second time presses his claim upon the notice of the King. There are two ways of accounting for Clarendon's total reserve upon the subject. It may have been that he feared the controversy would be inexpedient—that he might not be able to produce evidence sufficient to convince the world against Gauden's positive assertions. Indeed, there is no one who, on the first perusal of these letters, is not amazed by the boldness of this claim, and many would in consequence abandon the field to Gauden for ever, without further investigation. The controversy to which they would give rise must, whatever its issue, be most unseasonable. 'If he meddled with the affair at all,' it would cease to be a secret, 'and please none but Mr. Milton.' Of course it would, because the result must either bring discredit on the Crown or stamp one of the bishops with indelible disgrace at a moment when it was of the greatest importance that the prelates should stand well with the people. There is yet

another and more satisfactory explanation of Clarendon's conduct. The matter was communicated to him under the seal of secrecy; therefore he could not in honour make any of those investigations which after such a disclosure would have been necessary for his own satisfaction. In his letter he evidently desires to impress upon Gauden's mind that he had taken the secret, the grand 'arcanum,' as he had received it, without investigation or enquiry. Why? Because he did not think himself 'at liberty to do so.' What wonder, then, that he should impatiently exclaim, 'I am sorry I ever knew it'?

We have it, then, under Lord Clarendon's own hand that he made no enquiry: the motive we can only conjecture. It may be that he had received the 'particular' which, he says, 'I doe confesse was imparted to me *under secrecy*' from Charles II., to whom we know Gauden had already communicated it, and that the King had laid his commands upon him to make no enquiries. But whatever the motive for this reserve, it must always be a subject of great regret to the advocates of the royal cause. Had he consulted Dr. Morley, the witness upon whose testimony Gauden pretended to rely, the mind of the great statesman would soon have been relieved of so intolerable a burden. Let us compare what Gauden says of Morley with what did really occur. Gauden says:—

'Dr. Morley once offered me my option, upon the account of some service that he thought I had done extraordinary for the Church and Royal Family, of which he told me your Lordship was informed. . . . I insist much upon what Dr. Morley, now Bishop of Worcester, frankly told me after the King's first coming to Whitehall—that I might have what preferment I desired, such an esteem he then put on me and the "services" he knew I had done.'

These expressions of 'service' are not peculiar to the *Icon*, but may well apply to services of a more general character—as, for instance, a folio volume, *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria*, written in defence of the hierarchy, in order to promote the Restoration, and several other works of this nature. Of these Lord Clarendon, and Morley, and all the world, might well be aware.<sup>1</sup> We might, indeed, safely attribute to their influence the selection of the writer to fill one of the vacant bishoprics. But as to Morley having thought or suggested to Clarendon that Dr. Gauden was the author of *Icon Basilikè*, the question may be for ever set at rest by Morley's own last message to Clarendon, which has been preserved to us.

<sup>1</sup> See *Clarendon Papers*, vol. iii. p. 704.

Henry, son and successor of the Earl of Clarendon, obtains, in May 1674, the royal permission to visit his banished father, then in a state of declining health in France. On his way to the coast the son visits the aged bishop (Morley) at Farnham, to learn if he has any commands to his exiled friend.

'Among several things his Lordship had in charge from the Bishop to say to his father, he bade him tell him "that the King had very ill people about him, who turned all things into ridicule; that they endeavoured to bring him to have a mean opinion of the King his father, and to persuade him that his father was not the author of the book which goes by his name."'

Now can any one imagine Morley's sending such a message to Lord Clarendon if he either believed or had been the means of making Clarendon believe, Gauden, and not the King, to have written the book. Clarendon receives the message from his son, and his exclamation is, 'Good God! I thought the Marquis of Hertford had satisfied the King in that matter.' Indeed, it goes further, and shows plainly enough that Clarendon had reason to believe that Lord Hertford, whom Mrs. Gauden claimed as one of *her* witnesses, had been himself the means of exposing the fallacy to Charles II. And no person could be better qualified to satisfy the King than Lord Hertford, inasmuch as he is reported to have had in his possession a manuscript of the *Icon*, confided to him by the King's (Charles I.) own hands. Nevertheless the anti-Royalist pamphlet the *Amyntor* pretends to think that this is no expression of Clarendon's judgment in favour of the King! The son, Henry, Earl of Clarendon, amazed at the impudence of the author, writes a letter to explain that he understood these words in quite a different sense—'namely, that my father thought the Marquis of Hertford had satisfied King Charles II. that his father was the author of the book which goes under his name, and the rather because I never heard my father let fall the least word as if he doubted the King's being the author of the book.'<sup>1</sup> That Clarendon should have confined his observations to this ejaculation is only in accordance with the total reserve which he maintained throughout the transaction. Had he lived to return to England, and there to put the last touches to his History, and had he then still preserved this silence after the message had been brought to him from Morley, it would have been inscrutable; but we must re-

<sup>1</sup> *Defence of the 'Vindication of King Charles the Martyr,' 1699.*



member that he was in exile at the time of Gauden's death, and that if by that death he considered himself released from the seal of secrecy he had then no means of enquiring further into the matter, nor were these means ever again placed within his reach, as he died in banishment.

The silence of Lord Clarendon is closely connected with the line of conduct pursued by the royal brothers (Charles II. and the Duke of York) in the matter of Gauden's claim, as the evidence would lead us to imagine that Clarendon may have heard from them of Gauden's pretensions before they were communicated to him by Gauden himself. The 'Anglesey note' has always been brought forward as the chief positive proof of their belief in Dr. Gauden's claim. This is a memorandum written in an *Icon Basilikè* purchased at the sale of Lord Anglesey's books in 1686. It is to the effect that when Lord Anglesey showed to King Charles II. and the Duke some corrections in the book written with their father's own hand, they assured him that the book was not compiled by their father, but by Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter. The note is signed 'Anglesey,' but the Earl's son, Lord Altham, does not scruple to condemn the whole thing as a forgery.

Burnet mentions in his History,<sup>1</sup> written at the period of this supposed discovery, how, 'being brought up in a high veneration for the *Icon Basilikè*, when some denied it to be the King's he asked the Earl of Lothian, who both knew the King very well and loved him *little*, and he was confident that it was the King's work, because he had heard him say a great many of those very periods that are found in the book.' Burnet was, therefore, not a little surprised when, 'in talking very freely about matters of religion to the Duke of York, and urging him somewhat out of his father's book, the Duke should have affirmed that it was not his father's writing.' The Gauden story was then quoted by the Duke, with the additional testimony of the Duke of Somerset, who, says Burnet, 'Dr. Gauden brought with the Earl of Southampton to the King [Charles II.] to confirm his story.' But here again the evidence fails. The Duke of Somerset could not 'go to the King,' because he was dead several weeks before Gauden urged his claim. So that, while we cannot question but that the Duke of York made this reply to Burnet, it would seem, when examined, to rest upon the mere statement contained in Gauden's own letters. But if the royal brothers were indeed firmly convinced of the truth of this statement, their

<sup>1</sup> *History of his Own Time*, vol. i.

conduct towards Gauden, from mere motives of prudence, must have been different.

It is a favourite argument with the advocates of Gauden's claim to say that he advanced his pretensions with secrecy, and that he received, '*as the price of his silence*,' first 'the bishopric of Exeter, and afterwards, when he complained of the poverty of that see, the richer bishopric of Worcester.'<sup>1</sup> But the facts, taking the evidence only from Gauden's side, will not bear out this statement of the case. In the first place, there is the Bishop's own testimony—'True, I played this best card in my hand something too late, else might I have sped as well as Dr. Reynolds and some others; but I did not lay it as a ground of ambition, nor use it for a ladder.' Then in one of the passages which might be quoted from Mrs. Gauden's 'narrative' and letters, we find her saying, 'The King being still ignorant of what he [Gauden] had done, he was, by the mediation of a person perfectly ignorant of his merit as to this matter, made Bishop of Exeter.'

Afterwards Gauden prefers his claim, when 'his Majesty did then profess to my husband that he knew nothing to the contrary but that the book had been his father's.' The Duke of York makes the same remark. And here we may observe, by the way, that for *twelve years* neither of the royal brothers had entertained any doubt but that the book was written by their father. Exeter, therefore, can scarcely be said to have been given him as 'the price of his silence.' As to Worcester, his secret was indeed known before his promotion to that see, but it did not obtain for Gauden what he had set his heart upon—Winchester—where he had already built himself a magnificent house for his habitation, but he was put off with Worcester. And to whom was Winchester given? To Morley, the one bishop on the bench who, if we are to believe Gauden's story, only knew, and best knew, why Gauden was to be satisfied at any cost. It is easy to judge from this how low a price the Court put upon his silence, if indeed it can be called any price at all when we find that the Court refused the petty boon—not merely refused, but gave away to others the boon of a remission of a half-year's first-fruits of the see of Worcester, and this they did when Mrs. Gauden affirms 'that she could make it appear that her husband's estate was near a thousand pound the worse for his removal.' Certainly she is right in saying that 'for what her husband had writ with the hazard both of his life and fortune he never did

<sup>1</sup> Lingard, vol. vi. p. 637.

receive *anything*'—not Exeter or Worcester, nor *anything* at all. Such being the real state of the case, we are forced to suppose that, like Lord Clarendon, the royal brothers did not investigate the matter. The stress of any such investigation must rest chiefly upon them. No effort of the kind seems to have been made, and this is unhappily too much in accordance with much of their conduct after the Restoration towards their father's memory. The same motive which held them back from adequately rewarding those faithful followers and servants who had lost all for him checked any enquiries into the matter of the *Icon Basilikè*. An investigation of the subject must be attended with a double inconvenience. Had they succeeded in restoring to the King the right of which Gauden had endeavoured to rob him, the investigation necessary to refute the Bishop's claim would only have produced a host of new claimants to the royal bounty. On the other hand, had Gauden's claim been substantiated, he would have been able to demand whatever they could offer him. By leaving the matter uncertain and undecided they avoided either necessity, and they left themselves a convenient loophole to escape from those arguments in favour of the Church of England which were distasteful to them, especially when urged, as Burnet has told us, 'with somewhat out of their father's book.' Again, the book itself was in so many ways a tacit reproach to their own conduct that they were willing to seize any excuse for robbing its precepts of their force, and for avoiding the example of a life so different from theirs. It is deeply to be regretted that they should have taken such a course, for when we sift the whole evidence in favour of Gauden's story we see that there was nothing publicly known in those times against the King's authorship which did not derive its source either directly or indirectly from them, and they derived their information from Gauden. As Dr. Wordsworth concisely puts it, 'the whole case for Gauden centres ultimately in himself, and in himself alone.' And is Gauden's evidence—faulty, full of discrepancies and falsehoods—to stand against that which can be produced for the King?

There is one argument for the King's right to the authorship of the book which, if it can be satisfactorily proved, is admitted even by the advocates of the rival claim to be conclusive against Gauden—if it can be clearly shown that a copy of the *Icon Basilikè* was in the King's possession several years before there is any pretence of Gauden having thought of writing such a book, and three years before there was any

question of his manuscript being conveyed, as he asserts, to the King in the Isle of Wight. 'Let this statement,' says one of the antagonists of the royal cause, 'be confirmed beyond dispute, and no after explanation, supposing any to be attempted, can save Gauden from the effect of it; it must crush him and his pretensions at once.'<sup>1</sup> It would be easy to cite, not only from the Royalist pamphlets, but also from those on the opposite side, an abundance of instances to prove this fact; but we must refer our readers to Dr. Wordsworth's elaborate work for the details of this evidence. The limits of a review will only admit of an outline of the origin of the book, with the history of its gradual growth under the royal hand. The King at the very beginning of his troubles withdrew to Whitehall, and passed two or three days—March 1641—at his palace at Theobalds. It was then that he first conceived the design of his book and began to put it into execution.

The following is the account of one who had been for many years a constant servant to the King:—

'The King was pleased,' says he, 'some few days after he had retired from his Parliament, to communicate his thoughts in his garden at Theobalds to some of his gentlemen who were nearest to him . . . how he had set his hand to paper to vindicate his innocency, in the first place by showing the reasons he had of receding from his Parliament, which he hoped should not choose but render full satisfaction to all his subjects, unless they were of such a temper as had pertinaciously asserted a disaffection to his person, and that not so much as one line had fallen from his pen which with honour he might not confirm were it racked by never so rigid or uncharitable a construction.'

This refers to the first chapter. His next essay, the author proceeds to tell us, the King intended to be upon Strafford<sup>2</sup>—'one,' he said, 'whom I cannot without a pious and religious sorrow remember, condemning myself in nothing more than in suffering my hand to thwart the resolution of my heart.'

One portion of the pamphlet treats of the comfort the King derived from his work; another, of the hours he reserved for this exercise—the first hours of the day for his morning devotions, the next 'for those Meditations which he had now in hand.' All this testimony belongs to the year 1641. That which follows is still more important; it is contained in the pamphlet we have already quoted,<sup>3</sup> and in that of another

<sup>1</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, part ii. p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See *Icon Basilikè*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *The Princely Pelican*, quoted in *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, pp. 61–5.

equally positive and distinct<sup>1</sup> as to the copy found on the field of Naseby. This battle, it will be remembered, was fought June 14, 1645. (The date of Gauden's manuscript, fixed by himself and acquiesced in by his two witnesses, Mrs. Gauden and Dr. Walker, is the latter end of the year 1647.)

'In the field at Naseby . . . there, I say, at Naseby, upon discomfiture of his Majesty's forces, amongst other rich prizes was this inestimable gem, the continuation of his meditations, which he had gone along with to this success of that day, seized upon by the enemy with other papers and characters of concern, being enclosed in a cabinet reserved for that purpose. But such was the benignity of the conqueror, or Divine providence rather, that would not suffer so excellent a work to perish in oblivion, nor to be exposed to the rude razing hand of an illiterate soldier, that it was recovered above all expectance, and returned to his Majesty's hand, though the perusal of his papers were left to a more racking censure.'<sup>2</sup>

And the other pamphlet: 'I do verily believe you think this is the King's own book as much as I do, or any man else. There are some in the army' (alluding, perhaps, to Fairfax and Cromwell) 'that know it to be true enough, and some have been converted by it, or the King had never had it again after it was lost at Naseby.'<sup>3</sup>

Here, then, we have three important points. The *Icon* was taken along with the King's papers in the cabinet at Naseby; it was restored to him by the clemency of the conqueror; while it was in the enemy's hands it was perused by several persons, who were converted in consequence from his enemies into his friends. It is important to dwell upon the manner in which the book was at length restored to the King. His friends, Dr. Gorge, chaplain to his army on that fatal field, and the Archbishop of Armagh (Ussher) both received the royal commands to obtain it, if possible, out of 'the hand of the faction,' but without success. The person to whom this recovery was at length due was Major Huntington—'major,' says Lord Clarendon, 'to Cromwell's own regiment of horse, upon whom he relied in any enterprise of importance more than upon any man, and had been employed by him to the King to say those things from him which had given the King the most confidence.'<sup>4</sup> And this testimony is supported first by Sir W. Dugdale, in 1681, when he published his *Short View of the Troubles of England*. Some writers have contended that Sir William Dugdale refers to another manu-

<sup>1</sup> *The Princely Pelican*, quoted in *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 70.

<sup>4</sup> *History of the Rebellion*, vol. iii. p. 113.

script, called the *Memorials of the War*, written by Sir Edward Walker, the King's secretary at war, revised by the King, and also lost on the field of Naseby. Still more minute evidence as to the character of the papers restored by Major Huntington will confirm Sir William Dugdale's statement. We cite only one or two of the most striking testimonies.

(1) Mr. Cave Beck (of Ipswich, Suffolk):—

'That some years after the King's trial Major Huntington, at Ipswich, assured me that so much of his Majesty's book as contained his meditations before Naseby fight was taken in the King's cabinet, and that Sir Thomas Fairfax delivered the said papers unto him and ordered him to carry them to the King. And the Major affirmed that he read them over before he delivered them, and that they were the same for matter and form with those meditations in the printed book, and that he was much affected with them, and from that time became a proselyte to the royal cause. He also told me that when he delivered them to the King his Majesty appeared very joyful, and said he esteemed them more than all the jewels he had lost in the cabinet.'<sup>1</sup>

(2) Another, Sir Paul Whichcott, testifies to having heard his father, Sir Jeremy Whichcott, tell that he had the *Icon Basilikè* some time in his hands, lent him by Major Huntington, and that he transcribed about seventeen chapters, as he would have done the whole had not the Major been in haste to restore it to the King.

(3) Mr. Rowney, of Oxford, a special friend of Major Huntington, in a statement attested by several witnesses, bearing date Oxford, May 12, 1699, testifies what he had from the mouth of Major Huntington—that

'The King solicited him to obtain his papers, taken in his cabinet at Naseby, from General Fairfax; that the Major undertook it, went in person to the General, and obtained them; that on his return he had the curiosity to read a good part of them, and was highly pleased with them; that the King received them with infinite satisfaction and respect; and that upon the publishing the *Icon* he declared that he remembered several passages in the said papers, and did believe both to be the same and the King's own book.'

We will close the evidence as to the Naseby copy with the testimony of the officer—Colonel Okey—who at the head of his regiment of dragoons 'did mightily annoy the King's right wing of horse as they advanced towards the Parliament army.' This officer affirms that on several occasions he saw those sheets of the *Icon Basilikè* which were taken in King

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Walker's *True Account strictly Examined* by Thomas Long, B.D., and Prebendary of St. Peter's, Exeter, 1693.



Charles I.'s cabinet with his letters at Naseby.<sup>1</sup> And with that of Mr. Prynne, who, by order of the Parliament, had the perusal of the papers after they were sent up to London.

'He did not doubt but that the book was the King's own work, because as much of it as was wrote before Naseby fight was taken there, and sent up with the letters which the Parliament afterwards printed to London, where he, by their order, had the perusal of all the papers, and then and there saw those chapters of the *Icon Basilikè* that were wrote before that time, which he knew to be the same that were afterwards published.'<sup>2</sup>

We must continue to bear in mind that, according to Gauden, the King first heard of and saw the manuscript of the *Icon Basilikè* a fortnight before the Treaty of Newport (September 1648). We have, however, found it on the field of Naseby (June 1645), written up to that date. It has been restored to the King. Nor are we ignorant of its fate during the next three eventful years. Several witnesses are forthcoming to prove not only its existence, but also its gradual progress during that time—one gentleman, for instance, whom the author of the pamphlet<sup>3</sup> 'has not the liberty to name during his life,' who attended the King in the civil wars, and had an opportunity to peruse part of that chapter in the royal *Icon* on the 'Queen's Departure out of England,'<sup>4</sup> while the ink was yet wet, the King having been suddenly summoned away. Another, at Holmby House—Dr. Dillingham, Master of Emanuel College, Cambridge—read 'in the King's closet, while his Majesty was at dinner, several sentences of a paper newly written, and declared after the *Icon* came out that he found these the very same things, word for word, as he had thus read at Holmby.'<sup>5</sup> When the King was forcibly removed thence (June 1647) by Cornet Joyce and his soldiers, it was stipulated that his trunks and papers should not be rifled or tumbled. 'Here were parcels of his *Icon Basilikè*, and some other choice pieces, as was known since.'<sup>6</sup> Several nights previous to his escape from Hampton Court, in the November of that same year, two persons recommended by Bishop Juxon, at the desire of the King, sat up to assist him in arranging the papers of the *Icon Basilikè*, all written with the King's own hand. During his long confinement at Carisbrook the unhappy monarch found his only solace in this

<sup>1</sup> Wagstaffe's *Vindication*, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Young's *Several Evidences*, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *Icon Basilikè*, chap. vii.

<sup>5</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, p. 117.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

interesting work. Twice Colonel Hammond publicly testified to having found in the King's chamber there many sheets of the *Icon*, in the King's own handwriting. 'The book was undoubtedly his; for when I had the order for viewing and searching his papers' (this was in March 1648, six months before the journey of the Marquis of Hertford and Bishop Duppa) 'I found amongst them many sheets of the rough draught of that book in his own handwriting, which I have at this time by me.' 'This I heard the said Hammond declare, and am ready to attest it upon oath if required.—John Wight.'<sup>1</sup>

'Part of that book, if not the whole, was writ when he was my prisoner in Carisbrook Castle, where I am sure he had nothing but a Bible, pen, ink, and paper; and going to call him out of his closet to dinner, which I always did, I found him still a-writing; and staying behind to see what he writ, the paper being still wet with ink, I read at several times most of that book which now bears that title.'

This last speech was an answer to the sneer of the regicide Ludlow that the 'King had neither piety nor parts to write such a book as that is.'<sup>2</sup> One of the gentlemen—Mr. Anthony Mildmay—who attended the King at Carisbrook received from him the present of a Bible. In this book there were many verses marked with a pen, especially in the Book of Psalms. After the *Icon* was published the gentleman compared the Bible with the verses cited in the book. 'I found,' says he, 'they did exactly agree. I have the Bible to show, and can give any man satisfaction.'

Wade, a captain in the Parliament army, having seen and studied the manuscript, threw up his commission, saying 'he would no longer be such a prince's jailer.' Reading, one of the pages appointed by the Parliament, declared that he had often seen his Majesty writing the *Icon Basilike*; that when he was tired of writing he would sit down or walk about the room dictating what he desired to be written.

The evidence accumulates round this last period of the history of the manuscript. Mr. Herbert, a faithful servant of the King, who attended him on his last fatal journey to Whitehall, receives a manuscript copy from the royal hand.<sup>3</sup> Colonel Legge, the Groom of the Bedchamber, affirms his belief that the King, and the King only, wrote the book. And there are numerous testimonies, besides the one already mentioned, from Levett, the page of the royal bedchamber.

'If anyone has a desire to know the true author of a book entitled

<sup>1</sup> Wagstaffe's *Vindication*, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 98-9.

<sup>3</sup> Herbert's *Memoirs*, p. 45.

*Icon Basilikè*, I, one of the servants of King Charles the First in his bedchamber, do declare, when his said Majesty was prisoner in the Isle of Wight, that I read over the above-mentioned book (which was long before the said book was printed) in his bedchamber, writ with his Majesty's own hand, with several interlinings. Moreover, his Majesty King Charles the First told me, "Sure, Levett, you do design to get this book by heart," having often seen me reading it.<sup>1</sup> I myself very often saw the King write that which was printed in that book, and did daily read the manuscript of his own hand in many sheets of paper. . . . I do truly believe that there is not a page of that book but what I have read under the King's hand before it was printed.<sup>2</sup>

After the Treaty of Newport, when the King was hurried in the dead of night to Hurst Castle, 'during the time of his Majesty's making himself ready he concerned himself only how to secure this book of his. . . . He gave me in charge this said book, which I faithfully presented to his Majesty's own hands that night in Hurst Castle.' From W. Levett we also hear of the preparations made for the printing of the book :

'Mr. Richard Royston told mee this day that his late Ma<sup>y</sup> of blessed memory, King Charles the First, did send to him about Michmas before his martirdome to provide a Presse ; for hee had a booke of his owne for him to print. That upon Xmas Eve the said Booke came to his hande, brought to him by Mr. Simmons, a divine (since deceased). He supposed the same was sent to him by Dr. Duppa, late Bishop of Winchester. That his late Majesty did send with the coppie in manuscript a crown with wreathes of thorns ; but before the printing thereof, and immediately after Xmas holliday 1648, his Majestie sent another figure to be engraven in copper and annexed to the booke with "C.R." in it, and instead thereof sent that with his own effigie by . . . . [blank in original] 1648 printed with the first booke.'<sup>3</sup>

This was the copy which the Royalist Symmons affirms to have been written with the King's own hand, and to have been delivered to him by the King himself from under 'his blue watchet waistcoat.'<sup>4</sup> But at this critical moment, when the manuscript was passing out of the keeping of the royal author into the hands of the printer, it was overtaken by the same hapless fate which throughout his life seemed doomed to mar at the crisis every scheme devised by the unfortunate sovereign. The press was prepared, in obedience to the

<sup>1</sup> Signed and sealed, Oct. 16, 1690, William Levett.

<sup>2</sup> Autograph letter, quoted p. 172.

<sup>3</sup> Wagstaffe's *Vindication*, p. 107. The statement as to the 'blue waistcoat' is confirmed by a contemporary ode on *A Portrait of the King in a Blue Waistcoat*, beginning—

'Here shines in a field azure such a star,' &c.

King's command ; but before the precious MS. was consigned to the care of Royston, *it was borrowed of Mr. Symmons by Dr. Gauden, who sat up a whole night to transcribe it.*

This is the culminating piece of the whole evidence, and the reader will naturally expect to know the exact source whence it is derived. It is given at full length in Young's *Several Evidences*, and we will reduce it to as small a compass as possible. Mr. Le Pla, minister of Finchinfield (about six miles from Bocking, of which place, it will be remembered, Gauden was rector), writes a letter, dated Nov. 26, 1696, in which he describes a certain William Allen, a servant for many years in Gauden's family—

'who came to see me ; and after dinner, being alone with him, I fell into discourse with him about Dr. Gauden and the King's book. He said most people thought his master to be the author of it, or to have had the chief hand in it, or to that purpose. I told him I could never believe it for some reasons I then gave him. Whereupon he smiled and told me he could say more to that business than any man besides him ; for that Dr. Gauden told him he had borrowed the book, and was obliged to return it by such a time ; that, besides what other time he might employ in it, he sate up one whole night to transcribe it ; that he, William Allen, sate up in the chamber with him to wait upon him, to make his fires, and snuff his candles. . . . I think he said this book was borrowed of Mr. Symmons, of Raine,<sup>1</sup> one of the King's chaplains. . . . That which makes it very probable that Dr. Gauden had the book from Mr. Symmons is the near neighbourhood and great familiarity which I am told was between them. . . . Allen could read and write very well, and so could not easily be deceived either in the book or in his master's, though the Doctor had not told him that it was none of his.'<sup>2</sup>

This testimony is further supported by a nephew of Mr. Symmons, the Rev. Robert Rogers, who declares his belief 'that Dr. Gauden borrowed the King's book from Mr. Symmons, of Raine, and transcribed it ; and this Mr. Allen, Dr. Gauden's quondam servant, who was an eye-witness thereof, hath often declared in my hearing.'<sup>3</sup>

Such was the origin of the false claim of Gauden to the authorship of the *Icon Basilikè*. The history of the true manuscript is rapidly drawing to its close. It was transcribed, by the King's order, by Mr. Oudart, secretary to Sir Edward Nicholas, and this transcript was printed, according to the testimony of the two apprentices who set up the types at

<sup>1</sup> 'The distance between Raine church and Bocking church does not exceed a mile and a half.—*Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> Young's *Several Evidences*, p. 8.

Grisman's (a printer employed by Royston) press. One of these apprentices—James Clifford by name—had already been, as he expresses it, 'an actuary' in several 'things published by King Charles,' particularly the letter between him and Mr. Alexander Henderson, who endeavoured to persuade the King to favour the Presbyterian Government. By a curious coincidence he had also printed one of Dr. Gauden's tracts, *The Religious and Loyal Protestation*, and this circumstance gives additional weight to his assertion that

'Dr. Gauden was never concerned in that copy of the *Icon* from which he printed it, and that they had no part of the copy from Dr. Walker.' 'And withal,' he adds, 'I do declare that the King, for fear the original should miscarry, ordered Mr. Oudart, secretary to Sir Edward Nicholas, Principal Secretary of State, to transcribe it, and lodged the original in the Lord Marquis of Hertford's hands; and by the copy of Mr. Oudart Mr. Milbourn and myself (it being the way of livelihood I took to, being turned out of Magdalen College, in Oxford, for my loyalty) did print the said book; after the printing of which a great part was seized in Mr. Symmons's lodgings.'

The original copy, in the King's own hand, for which he had himself designed and executed a frontispiece with appropriate mottoes, was afterwards presented by the King to Mr. Symmons, taken by Mr. Symmons to Mr. Dugard's press, and there printed. The corrector of the press—or, to use his own words, the 'peruser of the royal original'—Dr. Edward Hooker, 'further testifieth that Mr. Dugard having thus printed the book, and it coming to be known, he was thrown into prison and turned out of the Merchant Taylors' School; and Mr. Hooker went to travel for several years.'

Several copies were printed and distributed by Mr. Symmons among his friends at Fowey. 'I have seen,' says Mr. Young, 'several of these books so sent, and have heard divers worthy inhabitants of that loyal corporation affirm what I say. Two or three are still living.'<sup>1</sup> The active share taken by Mr. Symmons in the printing and publication of the book exposed him to imminent peril. He fled for his life to France, was apprehended at Gravesend and placed in custody, but before his examination he caught the small-pox and died (March 29, 1649). After his death

'repeated attempts were made,' we read, 'upon Mrs. Symmons, both by threats and promises, to induce her to say on the authority of her husband that the book was not the King's; but she continued firm, and many years afterwards, to persons on each side of the contro-

<sup>1</sup> Young's *Several Evidences*, p. 16.

versy, she gave numerous and distinct accounts, all concurring with one another, and declared that her husband lived and died persisting (what she herself also firmly believed) that the book was the King's.'

Such is a rapid sketch of the origin and history of the *Icon Basilikè*, supported by the testimony of living witnesses whose eyes had seen the ink of the royal handwriting not yet dry upon the page, whose ears had heard the King speak many of the paragraphs as they now appear in the book. They are the links which form an unbroken chain of evidence from the moment when the King first conceived the idea of the book to the day of his murder, when it was published and placed in the hands of the people. These testimonies, though numerous, from all parts of the kingdom, agree together; they are direct and certain; most of them are attested by the hand and seal of one or two witnesses. They do not spring only from the Royalist side; those which bear most directly upon the case are supplied by the King's enemies—the officer who routed his cavalry at Naseby, the major of Cromwell's own regiment of horse, the commissioner appointed by the Parliament to examine the royal papers, the governor of Carisbrook Castle while the King was a captive within its walls. The only direct evidence upon which Gauden's claim may be said to rest is that of his wife and his curate, Dr. Walker, testimonies which, it has been seen, conflict with each other and are full of inconsistencies and contradictions. Not one of the witnesses on whom they rely to support this claim can be proved to have ever opened their lips upon the subject. Two of these—Lord Hertford and Bishop Morley—give direct evidence on the opposite side. To Lord Hertford's keeping the original manuscript, in the King's own hand, was entrusted; Bishop Morley with his dying breath sends an emphatic message to Lord Clarendon that the book was written by the King, and by him alone. A third—Lord Capel—is proved to have been in strict imprisonment at the time, and could, therefore, not have been communicated with at all. Lastly, Gifford, the curate cited by Dr. Walker, delivers his opinion on a most solemn occasion that the book was written by the King, and his name suggests a saying of Mrs. Gauden condemning in the strongest terms the fraud practised by her husband in the matter. It only remains to speak of what has been called the 'internal evidence.' If there were no external evidence to be produced on either side, the King's claims to the authorship of the book might very well rest upon the internal evidence alone. To borrow the words of Hume—



'These meditations resemble, in elegance, purity, neatness, and simplicity, the genius of those performances which we know with certainty to have flowed from the royal pen, but are so unlike the bombast, perplexed, rhetorical, and corrupt style of Dr. Gauden, to whom they are ascribed, that no human testimony seems sufficient to convince us that he was the author. Yet all the evidences which would rob the King of that honour tend to prove that Dr. Gauden had the merit of writing so fine a performance and the infamy of imposing it on the world as the King's.'<sup>1</sup>

Persons contemporary with the publication of the *Icon Basilikè* aver that not only no man but King Charles could have written the book, but that the King himself could not have written it had he not been in trouble and suffering. If we consider it as a private book of devotion, we find a sincerity and depth of religious thought, a fervour of expression, which make it well-nigh impossible to believe that these meditations should not have sprung from the soul of the person who utters them. Again, the exactness of the personal application argues a perfect knowledge of those secrets of the inmost heart which are open to none but the individual himself and his God.

As a history of the King in his public capacity there is no record, not even that of Clarendon, which gives us a better opportunity of studying the minute details of his policy and the motives by which it was prompted. As a literary composition, it has been questioned whether the King was capable of arranging these fragments of autobiography in so clear and concise a manner, and of describing them in a style at once so simple and majestic. To this we may answer that the composition, when it first appeared as the King's work, excited no surprise in the minds of those who were best able to judge of his capabilities in this matter—Sir Edward Hyde and the Secretary of State Sir Edward Nicholas. They were indeed full of admiration, but surprise, much less distrust, never entered their thoughts. Sir Edward Nicholas calls it 'the most exquisite, pious, and princely piece I ever read';<sup>2</sup> Sir Edward Hyde, the 'immortal monument he hath left behind him.'<sup>3</sup> And many a reference to the private letters of these and others of the King's friends and ministers will prove that, while they often bewail the errors of his policy, their confidence in his moral and intellectual abilities remains to the last unshaken. The high opinion of the King's capacities was not

<sup>1</sup> Hume, *Hist. of England*, vol. vii. p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Carte's *Ormond Letters*, vol. i. p. 226.

<sup>3</sup> *Clarendon Papers*, vol. ii. p. 480, April 12, 1649, quoted in *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, pp. 228-9.

confined to the Royalists alone. Whitelock speaks of 'his great parts and abilities, strength of reason, and quickness of apprehension.' Sir Henry Vane complains that 'they have been much deceived in his Majesty, who was represented to them as a weak person, but that they found him a person of great parts and abilities.' Cromwell, it is known, observed that had the King followed his own judgment he would have 'fooled them all.'<sup>1</sup> If we examine the twenty-eight chapters of which the book is composed, we shall find that in each and all of these chapters the King first appears in his public character as a monarch speaking to his people, and secondly as a private individual, examining in all humility and penitence his motives and actions, with a view to the strict account that he must one day render to his Maker. It records, it is hardly necessary to say, the chief events which occurred between the years 1640-8 of his reign. The first seven chapters treat of those which immediately preceded the civil war.

(1) The summoning of the last Parliament. (2) The death of Strafford. Here we read in every sentence the bitter repentance of the King, springing from the depths of his soul; nor could any hand but his own have traced the painful fluctuations of his mind between 'my own unsatisfiedness in conscience and a necessitie (as some told mee) of satisfying the importunities of some people,' till 'I was perswaded by those that I think wished mee well to chuse rather what was safe than what seemed just, preferring the outward peace of my kingdom with men before that inward exactness of conscience with God.' We also find there the tribute to the one person (Juxon) 'who counselled mee not to consent against the voice of my conscience.' And if we compare this chapter with the King's private letters to Strafford, we shall see that both open in the same manner. 'I never met with a more unhappy conjuncture of affairs than in the business of this unfortunate Earl,' says the *Icon*. 'Strafford,' the letter begins, 'The misfortune that is fallen upon you by the strange mistaking and *conjuncture* of these times,' &c. And many points of resemblance similar to this are to be discovered throughout the two compositions. (3) His Majesty's going to the House of Commons to demand justice on the five members. (4) The insolence of the tumults. (5) The passing of the Bill for the Triennial Parliaments. (6) His retirement from Westminster, the date, as we have seen, when he first 'set his hand to paper to vindicate his innocence.' (7) The Queen's departure out of England, one of the most beautiful chapters in the book.

<sup>1</sup> Carte's *Life of Ormond*, vol. ii. p. 12.

So far the *Icon Basilike* had advanced when it was lost on the field of Naseby. After that time, on its being restored to the King, he added from time to time twenty-one more chapters, often revising and transcribing the whole during the enforced leisure of his captivity, during which transcriptions it is easy to understand that insertions were made in the previous chapters.<sup>1</sup> It concludes with meditations upon death, after the votes of non-addresses and his closer imprisonment in Carisbrook Castle.

It may be interesting, before taking leave of this autobiography, perhaps the most interesting of its kind that was ever written, to describe the external aspect of a copy of one of the earliest (1648) editions of the book. This copy, now in the hands of the writer, is a small duodecimo volume, bound in dark brown calf, with the royal initials surmounted by a crown on either side.<sup>2</sup> The frontispiece, common to this and all subsequent editions, was designed and executed, according to Mr. Symmons, by the King's own hand. The mottoes were for the most part his choice also, with the exception of two or three added by Mr. Edward Hooker, the corrector of the press, and William Marshall, the engraver. The copy of verses which is placed beneath the engraving bears the signature 'G. D.,' not signifying, as the advocates of Gauden's claim have endeavoured to assert, 'Gauden designed' or 'Gauden, Dean,' but 'Guglielmus Dugardus,' the author of the verses, the learned printer and master of the Merchant Taylors' School, who was utterly ruined at the time for the part he took in printing the King's book.

The comparison between the chapter on Strafford and the King's letter to that unfortunate nobleman has been quoted as an instance of the individual pieces of internal evidence which help to prove the authenticity of the King's book. We will only select one more out of the numerous testimonies which might be cited of this class. It was a constant habit with the King to write in his books and papers short sentences in Latin and other languages. A certain copy of verses called *Majesty in Misery: an Imploration to the King of Kings*, well known to be written by King Charles

<sup>1</sup> This remark, however obvious, is not unimportant, inasmuch as objections have been raised to the possibility of the earlier chapters having been written before Naseby fight, on the ground of their containing references to subsequent transactions.

<sup>2</sup> The title-page still bears the name of 'Dr. Hewett,' showing that the copy must at one time have belonged to 'that excellent preacher and holy man,' as he is called by Evelyn in his *Diary* (p. 257.) Dr. Hewett perished on the scaffold in 1648, the last martyr to the Royal cause.

when at Carisbrook Castle, ends with the following Latin sentence: 'Vota dabunt quæ bella negarunt,' and with this same sentence the *Icon Basilikè* also concludes. The poem and the book were written at the same time, and, in accordance with the King's usual practice, have this motto attached to them, a motto applicable to the subject of both compositions. This testimony, eminently satisfactory in support of the royal authorship, affords another proof of the falsity of Gauden's claim, for what can be more improbable than that he should hit upon the same words as those which had been used by the King at the close of a poem never seen by Dr. Gauden, and not known to the world till many years after his death? <sup>1</sup> Nor do we find that Gauden had any such opportunity of studying the King's character or temper of mind as to enable him to imitate exactly and reproduce his habits of thought. Thus the argument as to the *Icon Basilikè* being the work of a 'court parasite' or 'household priest' falls to the ground. Once only was Gauden in the King's presence, when he preached a sermon before him in 1641. There is no record of Gauden's having had any private communication with him at that time; and how little his sermon would conciliate him we may imagine when we hear that Gauden had shortly before received a silver tankard as an honorarium for a sermon contrary to the royal cause, which won him the favour of the Parliament, before whom it was preached.

It is in the study of Gauden's own character that we find the best means of accounting for a forgery so shameless and so daring as his claim to the *Icon Basilikè*. We learn from Bishop Kennet's *Register* that

'Gauden was capable of under-work. I took it once from the mouth of a very eminent primate that there was, in 1662, a declaration for liberty of conscience extending to Papists drawn up, and some printed copies of it worked off in a press, within Somerset House, though presently called in. And, what was the worst circumstance, the draught of it was framed by a bishop of the Church of England, even Dr. Gauden, the Bishop of Exeter, who had made himself the tool of the Court by the most sordid hopes of greater favour in it.'<sup>2</sup>

And several other instances are quoted by Dr. Wordsworth from Gauden's writings to prove his time-serving nature. After the Restoration he speaks of the King (Charles I.) 'as the greatest glory and most illustrious example of piety that sat on Christian throne, the most unspotted person, the wisest prince,' &c. &c. Before it he coldly says of him,

<sup>1</sup> It was first published by Burnet in his *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*.

<sup>2</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè'*, p. 377.

'Whatever his sin may be, yet I think him not criminal,' &c.<sup>1</sup> But the most flagrant instance of double-dealing is his poem *In Martyrium Caroli Primi* (January 30, 1648), which contains an actual reference to the *Icon Basilikè* as the King's book. Which are we to believe, the statement in the poem or that contained in the letter to Lord Clarendon? These and similar discrepancies are sufficient to show that Gauden was not a man whose character conciliates confidence. Dr. Wordsworth has certainly proved that upon his unsupported word rests the whole external evidence for his authorship of the book.

Long as Dr. Wordsworth's researches have been before the world, we think it in no way superfluous to bring their result once more before our readers now that renewed attention seems to be directed to the events and characters of the Caroline period. We do not forget the controversy which Dr. Wordsworth's publications roused, or the ingenuity of Dr. Todd, first in invalidating one or two points in the external evidence, and next in producing parallels between the *Icon* and known writings of Dr. Gauden's. But these were answered in Dr. Wordsworth's *Tracts* named at the head of this article, so that Dr. Wordsworth's evidence remains untouched, and we may well believe that the *Icon* is the genuine self-portraiture of the character of the unfortunate King. Many an historian has described the outline of that character, and each has put in the broad lights and shadows as they appeared in his eyes, but none but the individual himself could fill in those finer details of the mind, showing the stamp of solitude and suffering, those inward communings of the heart when he was 'in his chamber' and was 'still.' The closer study of the picture so portrayed would soften many a harsh judgment, and bring many a slander face to face with truth. More than two centuries have elapsed since this passage was written, and yet it continues to plead as with a living voice:—

'If I had not my own Innocencie and GOD'S protection, it were hard for Mee to stand out against those stratagems and conflicts of malice, which by Falsities seek to oppress the Truth, and by Jealousies to supplie the defect of Real causes which might seem to justifie so unjust Engagements against Mee. . . . For I can more willingly lose My Crown than My Credit; nor are my Kingdoms so dear to Mee as My Reputation and Honour. Those must have a period with My Life, but these may survive to a glorious kind of Immortalitie when I am dead and gone: A good Name being the embalming of Princes, and a sweet consecrating of them to Eternitie of Love and Gratitude among Posteritie.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Tracts on the 'Icon Basilikè,'* p. 389. <sup>2</sup> *Icon Basilikè,* ch. xv. p. 122.

## ART. IV.—THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

1. *The Psalms Translated from the Hebrew, with Notes chiefly Exegetical.* By WILLIAM KAY, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The Holy Bible, with Commentary.* Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A. Vol. IV. the 'Poetical Books.' (London, 1873.)
3. *The Psalms Chronologically Arranged.* By FOUR FRIENDS. Second Edition. (London, 1870.)
4. *The Psalms, with Introductions and Critical Notes.* By A. C. JENNINGS, M.A. Assisted in parts by W. H. LOWE, M.A. (London, 1877.)
5. *The Book of Psalms: a New Translation, with Introductions and Notes Explanatory and Critical.* By J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D. Fourth Edition, revised. (London, 1878.)

To judge from the volumes that lie before us, there seems to be something like a *consensus* among modern English critics that the Titles of the Psalms, whatever value may be attached to them, form no integral part of the text of Holy Scripture. Dr. Kay alone is consistent in upholding their authority throughout; in the *Speaker's Commentary* they are usually treated with considerable respect, though the editor appears to consider that they have no claim to be regarded as fixed portions of the Canon, and accordingly we find doubts expressed concerning their accuracy in some few places; while the 'Four Friends,' who, in their chronological arrangement of the Psalter blindly follow the guidance of Ewald; and Messrs. Jennings and Lowe appear substantially to agree with the verdict expressed in the popular Commentary of the Dean of Peterborough:—

'The Inscriptions cannot always be relied on. They are sometimes genuine, and really represent the most ancient tradition. At other times they are due to the caprice of later editors and collectors, the fruits of conjecture or of dimmer and more uncertain traditions. In short, the Inscriptions of the Psalms are like the Subscriptions to the Epistles of the New Testament: they are not of any necessary authority, and their value must be weighed and tested by the usual critical processes.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 103.



When, therefore, we find that, with but few exceptions, our modern English Commentators (following, as usual, the lead of the Germans), are agreed upon their right to treat the titles as no integral parts of the Psalms to which they are prefixed, we may fairly inquire what are the facts of the case, and what are the grounds that have led them to this conclusion.

And first, what are the facts of the case? To begin with, the comparison of the inscriptions with the subscriptions of the Epistles made by the Dean of Peterborough, and repeated with approval by the 'Four Friends'<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Jennings,<sup>2</sup> is wholly misleading. The subscriptions to the Epistles are wanting in the oldest MSS. and Versions; and are probably due to the conjecture of Euthalius, Deacon of Alexandria (A.D. 458), and in the MSS. in which they occur there is often considerable variety of form, as may easily be seen by a reference to the digest of various readings in any of the critical editions. 'In the earliest MSS.' writes Dr. Scrivener, 'the subscriptions as well as the titles of the books [*sc.* the Gospels], were of the simplest character. . . . The same is the case throughout the New Testament. After a while, the titles become more elaborate, and the subscriptions afford more information, the truth of which it would be hardly safe to vouch for.'<sup>3</sup>

Passing now to the Titles of the Psalms, all this is changed. Against them, *as a class*, not a tittle of external evidence can be brought: their form is identical in all MSS. and (with the slightest exceptions) Versions, whatever their date may be.<sup>4</sup> In fact, we may say that as regards external evidence, they stand on exactly the same footing as the Psalms themselves; and in favour of their genuineness, we point (1) to the consent of MSS. and Versions, and (2) to the fact that they were un-

<sup>1</sup> p. 438.

<sup>2</sup> *Introd.* p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Introd. to Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 60.

<sup>4</sup> This has been already pointed out by Mr. Armfield (*Gradual Psalms*, c. ii.), to whose argument the Dean of Peterborough replies in a note. 'Our earliest MS. of the Old Testament, of which the date is certain, is of the tenth century, whereas, we have MSS. of the New Testament of the fourth, a century earlier than the date at which the subscriptions were added. If the MSS. of the Old Testament were of corresponding antiquity, we might, in the same way, be able to trace the addition of the inscriptions. And this is rendered almost certain when we observe the variations of the LXX. and the Syriac, and when we further bear in mind that the historical inscriptions are prefixed only to David's Psalms.' What this last remark has to do with the subject, we confess that we are unable to see. The case of the LXX. and Syriac is considered in the text: and we would only add, that no reasonable man can doubt that the inscriptions were read by Origen and Jerome in their Hebrew MSS. *exactly as we have them in our own.*

intelligible to the translators of the LXX., and therefore considerably more ancient than that version.

(1) The consent of MSS. and Versions. There are absolutely no Hebrew MSS. in which they are omitted as a class. Of course, here and there, a particular title may be wanting in some few MSS., just as a word or a verse elsewhere may be, but there is nothing in the MSS. in the very least degree parallel to the variations in the subscriptions of the books of the New Testament. Nor are the Versions much less unanimous. It is true that the editor of the *Speaker's Commentary* can write, 'The variations of the inscriptions in the LXX. and other ancient Versions sufficiently prove that they were not regarded as fixed portions of the Canon, and that they were open to conjectural emendation;' but the case is surely overstated, and a reference to the Versions themselves rather leads to the opposite conclusion. The LXX. certainly often gives us additional titles, not found in the Hebrew, but in only two instances is a title existing in the Hebrew undoubtedly absent from the LXX., viz. cxxi.<sup>1</sup> and cxxiii. (Heb. cxxii. and cxxiv.); in three other Psalms (cxxvi., cxxx., cxxxii.) the balance of evidence seems in favour of the insertion of the titles in the LXX., though they are absent from the Roman text;<sup>2</sup> while the title prefixed to cxxxvii. (Heb. cxxxviii.) gives a remarkable instance of the reverence with which the translators regarded the Hebrew text before them. The title runs as follows: ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυὶδ Ἀγγαλὸν καὶ Ζαχαρίον. Even in this case, where the translators evidently referred the Psalm to the time of the Return from the Captivity, they have not ventured to expunge the title claiming David as its author. Nor are the translators of the LXX. alone in this reverence for the titles: they were treated as portions of the Psalms by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in all of whose versions they find a place: they are interpreted and explained in the Targum: prefixed in every case in the Latin Versions, from the LXX. of course in the Gallican Psalter, and so in the Vulgate; but translated anew from the Hebrew in Jerome's later version, which gives us convincing evidence that there has been no growth in the titles, standing as it does midway between the date of the LXX. and that of the oldest existing Hebrew MS. In fact, the only ancient translations in which

<sup>1</sup> The LXX. may here claim the support of the Targum, which also omits the title.

<sup>2</sup> The Vatican MS. is unfortunately wanting in this part. The Alexandrian has the titles in cxxx. and cxxxii., but not in cxxvi. For the evidence, see further Field's *Hexapla*.

they are ignored are the Christian versions in Syriac and Arabic, in both of which their places are generally occupied by titles, sometimes referring to the occasion of the original composition of the Psalms, but more often explaining their spiritual application. In these exceptions, however, it should be noticed that the titles are not *varied*, but *ignored*, entirely fresh ones being substituted; and it is by no means safe to infer that the titles were wanting in the MSS. from which the Versions were made. They were probably omitted to make room for the new ones explaining how the Psalms were interpreted by the Church.

(2) Secondly, we claim a still higher antiquity for the titles, from the fact that in many cases they were absolutely unintelligible to the translators of the LXX., the key to their true interpretation having been lost before that version was made. The information conveyed by the inscriptions is of three kinds, concerning (1) the author, (2) the circumstances under which the Psalm was composed, and (3) the liturgical use to be made of it. In the interpretation of the first two classes there is generally no sort of difficulty, and consequently these are fairly represented in the Greek and other Versions; but with regard to the third, the case is different. It would almost seem that the meaning of the liturgical directions was lost during the Babylonish Captivity, for there is no allusion to them in the Books of the Return, such as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai; while the solitary reference to them in Chronicles is in connexion with David's original arrangement of the musical service, and throws no light whatever on the expressions employed.<sup>1</sup> In any case, we can hardly suppose that the terms in question were in common use after the rebuilding of the Temple, and restoration of the musical service, or some surer traditions of their meaning must have survived, if not in the LXX., yet in the Targum or the Talmud.

Turning then to the LXX., and comparing the liturgical notices there with the corresponding passages in the Hebrew, we are at once struck by the hopeless ignorance of their meaning displayed by the translators. A few instances will suffice to make this clear. The well-known formula לְמַנְחָה (for the Precentor) which occurs in the inscriptions more than fifty times is invariably rendered *eis tò télos*, and other terms still unintelligible to us were even more so to these early translators, *e.g.*:—

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xv. 20, 21: the passage is probably taken from an older document.

- Ps. v. i. נִחִלֹת (A. V. upon Nehiloth) appears in the LXX. as *ὑπὲρ τῆς κληρονομουσης*.  
 Ps. viii. i ; lxxx. i ; lxxxiv. i. גִּתִּית (A. V. upon Gittith) *ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν*.  
 Ps. ix. i. מִתְּחִלָּה (A. V. upon Muth-labben) *ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ*.  
 Ps. xxii. i. אֵיזֶלֶת שָׁהָר (A. V. upon Aijelet Shahr) *ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἐσθλῆς*.  
 Ps. xlv. i. שׁוֹשַׁנִּים (A. V. upon Shoshannim) *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων*.  
 Ps. lxxxviii. i. מַהֲלַת לֵאנֹת (A. V. upon Mahalath Leanoth) *ὑπὲρ μαελεθ τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι*.

What conclusion can we possibly arrive at from a study of these examples, but this : That when the translation was made in the second century B.C., the titles were of no recent date, but that their origin and meaning were already lost in obscurity ? And this conclusion is confirmed by an examination of the titles themselves, and a consideration of the cases in which they are present or absent. In the first book (Pss. i.-xli.) four Psalms are without any title, viz., i., ii., x., xxxiii. ; of these, i. and ii. are introductory, and, according to S. Jerome, were reckoned as but one Psalm,<sup>1</sup> while x. is clearly due to the author of ix.—to which it is joined in four Hebrew MSS., as well as in the LXX.,—and xxxiii. is connected with xxxii. in at least ten MSS. In the second book (xlii.-lxxii.) there are only two ‘orphan Psalms,’ viz., xliii. and lxxi., of which xliii. is evidently a portion of xlii., being rightly joined to it in no less than forty-six MSS., and lxxi. forms but a part of lxx. in twenty-seven MSS. In the third book (lxxiii.-lxxxix.) titles of some sort are found in every case. In the fourth (xc.-cvi.) they are wanting in *eight*, and in only *three* instances is the name of the author given ; and in the fifth book (cvii.-cl.) they are absent from *eighteen* ; while of the *thirty-six* Psalms in this book in which some title is given, in only *sixteen* is the authorship mentioned, fifteen Psalms being assigned to David and one to Solomon. Now were these titles due to a late editor or compiler, we should expect that they would be fullest in those Psalms composed nearest to his own date, and that they would be absent from the earlier Psalms, concerning the composition of which information would presumably be more difficult to obtain. But as a matter of fact, precisely the reverse is the case. *The older the Psalm, the more confidently do we look for a title.* The fact is striking ; and it is

<sup>1</sup> So the *Talmud*: Tr. ‘Berachoth,’ f. 9. 2.

impossible to account for it on any theory, except that the titles formed part of the original Psalms, and were handed down with them from the days of David and the Kingdom. Again, the general omission of titles, more especially of those denoting authorship, in the later books tends to confirm our high opinion of the care and scrupulousness of the original editor of the Psalter in its present form; for were they due, as the Dean of Peterborough supposes, to 'caprice,' or were they 'the fruits of conjecture, or of dimmer and more uncertain traditions,' it would certainly be remarkable that this capricious editor had not exercised his ingenuity and power of guessing a little more, and given us a few additional conjectures, even if he had exhausted his stock of dim and uncertain traditions. Thus the existence of so many 'orphan Psalms' is of itself an indication that they were not prefixed carelessly and at random; and their position generally in the later books of the collection is an argument for the antiquity of the inscriptions which occur so much more frequently in the earlier ones.<sup>1</sup>

Once more, an examination of the titles themselves gives us a further argument for their antiquity. Not to mention that the title prefixed to Ps. xviii. is identical in form with 2 Sam. xxii. 1, and that others refer to well-known incidents in the life of David, we find that in some cases they have preserved independent historical notices, that could not by any possibility have been mere happy conjectures of a late editor, drawn from a careful study of the Books of Samuel. Such are the following:—

Ps. vii.—Shiggaion of David; which he sang unto the LORD concerning the words of *Cush the Benjamite*.

Ps. xxxiv.—A Psalm of David, when he changed his behaviour before *Abimelech*: who drove him away, and he departed.

Ps. lx.—Michtam of David, to teach; when he strove with *Aram-naharaim* and with *Aram-zobah*, when *Joab* re-

<sup>1</sup> The arguments in the text are perhaps confirmed by a reference to the use of the term '*Selah*,'—undoubtedly a musical direction of some kind, whatever its precise significance may be. The term occurs no less than seventy times in the course of the Psalter, but never once in an 'orphan Psalm.' It is frequent in the first three books, is never found in the fourth, and only four times in the fifth, and these four times in liturgical Psalms attributed to David, viz., cxl. and cxliii. Outside the Psalter it only occurs twice—in the hymn of Habakkuk (iii.). The inference is, that *Selah*, like the titles, is of extreme antiquity, and belongs only to the Psalms before the Captivity, when David's arrangements for the Psalmody were still in existence.

turned, and smote of Edom in the Valley of Salt *twelve thousand*.

In all these cases the very difficulty and originality of the title is a strong evidence of its authentic character; and it should never be forgotten that in common fairness the titles should be treated *as a class*: that they stand or fall together: that the external evidence is the same for all;<sup>1</sup> and that therefore we are not at liberty to accept those few that seem to commend themselves to our judgment, and reject others that, so far as the evidence is concerned, stand on precisely the same footing. If we accept the statement that David sang Ps. vii. concerning the words of Cush the Benjamite, then we are bound also to believe that Ps. li. is, as it professes to be, 'a Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bathsheba.' The evidence for both statements is one and the same, and we have no more right to treat them differently than we should have to take two verses of the New Testament, both supported by full external evidence of MSS. and Versions, and, while we accept one of them because its contents commend themselves to our judgment, reject the other because of difficulties and apparent contradictions in it. It is, of course, perfectly possible that occasionally a לְדָוִד may have been misplaced, or carelessly written by a scribe who had already copied out several Davidic Psalms, but (as we have already seen) many of the titles consist of whole verses, and not of single words, and therefore their presence or absence must be intentional, and cannot be set down to the score of carelessness and inadvertence.

Upon the whole, then, we may set down the results of our inquiry as follows:—

(1) There is no evidence that the titles are due to the caprice of a late editor, or to dim and uncertain traditions.

(2) That they have the same amount of evidence from MSS. and Versions as the rest of the Old Testament.

(3) That they were treated as an integral part of the Psalter, and so a portion of Holy Scripture as far back as we can trace the history of the text.

And the conclusion at which we arrive is this: That we

<sup>1</sup> The variations in the MSS. are but trifling. The following are all that are noticed by Davidson in his *Hebrew Text revised from critical sources*:—Ps. xliii. is attributed to David in a few MSS.; xlvii. to David in one (Cf. LXX., Alex.); lxvi. to David in one; lxvii. to David in a few MSS.; lxxii. omit Solomon, five MSS.; cviii. is given to Asaph, instead of David, in six MSS.; cxii. omit David, two MSS., LXX. Targ.; cxiv. omit David, two MSS., LXX.; cxxxiii. omit David, two MSS., and LXX. (Ed. Rom. insert Alex.).



have no right to apply a different method of treatment to them from that which we apply to the rest of the Old Testament: that we are not at liberty to reject them at our pleasure any more than we are to reject texts elsewhere that present difficulties or seem to involve contradictions. There seems to be no middle course: either the whole of the text of the Old Testament must be subjected to the knife of the critic, and those parts that fail to commend themselves to his judgment must be erased; or the whole text, as presented by MSS. and Versions, must be accepted by him as that which he is to explain and interpret, but not to mutilate and disintegrate. Either course is plain and simple, but there is no position between the two. It is uncritical to accept the text of the whole Psalm when you have carefully cut out the first verse!

The question has often been asked, and never yet answered, Why am I bound to accept the title of David's elegy in 2 Sam. i. 18? <sup>1</sup> ללמד בני-יהודה קשׁת הנה כחובה על-ספר הישר; I am at liberty to reject that of Ps. lx.: <sup>2</sup> מכתם לדור לדור; or what right have I to refuse to excise the words of Isaiah xxxviii. <sup>3</sup> מכתב לחזקיהו מלך-יהודה בחלתו ויחי מחליו 9; if I claim the liberty of ignoring the statement of Ps. lix. <sup>4</sup> לדור מכתם בשלח 1; שאול ויחמורו את-הבית לחמיתו; and once more, do I not forfeit my right to uphold Hab. iii. as a genuine composition of the prophet whose name it bears, or at least to point to its title as an evidence of authorship <sup>5</sup> תפלה לחבקוק הנביא על שגינות חבביא; if I fail to receive as true the first half of Ps. xc. ver. 1. <sup>6</sup> תפלה למשה איש האלהים:

We repeat it; there is no middle course between unlimited license and the acceptance of the Psalm titles as they stand as a portion of the text of the Old Testament; and we are the more earnest in enforcing this, because it is so little recognised at the present day, and because the treatment of the subject in our modern Commentaries is eminently inadequate. Things have come to such a pass that the external

<sup>1</sup> This should, perhaps, be rendered 'For the children of Israel to learn by heart. Kasheth from the book of Jasher.' See the *Speaker's Commentary*, in *loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Michtam of David, to teach &c.

<sup>3</sup> The writing of Hezekiah, the King of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness.

<sup>4</sup> Michtam of David, when Saul sent and they watched the house to kill him.

<sup>5</sup> A Prayer of Habakkuk, the prophet upon Shigionoth.

<sup>6</sup> A Prayer of Moses, the man of God.

evidence is barely noticed, and the critic claims in these verses a license that he dares not claim elsewhere, and demands liberty to accept or reject at his pleasure, in accordance with the dictates of what he is pleased to term 'internal evidence.' And what is the character of this internal evidence of which we hear so much? Is it such that we can with any confidence commit ourselves to its guidance, discarding what all must allow to be the most ancient traditions? If so, it will surely lead all commentators to the same result. We may fairly ask for something like a *consensus* of interpreters before we trust ourselves to it; but this is precisely what we cannot have. We will take Ps. lxxviii. as an example. The title tells us that it is by David; a statement repeated by the Targum, LXX., Aquila, Syriac and other Versions. This we are now told carries no authority; and we are bidden to discard the tradition, and tax our ingenuity to discover a fitting occasion for this 'Titan among Psalms,' as it has not inaptly been called. We turn to the Commentators to seek their help.

'It is reckoned by some to the later (Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld); by others to the latest (Rudinger, Reuss, Olshausen); by others still to the most ancient monuments of Hebrew poetry (De Wette, Böttcher, Hengstenberg, Hitzig, and Delitzsch)'! . . . 'It has been actually placed in the times of the Maccabees (Olshausen), especially with reference to the consecration of the Temple, 1 Macc. v. (Rudinger), in the time of the rule of the Ptolemies or the Seleucidæ (Reuss), in the period of the Exile, or shortly afterwards (Ewald, Köster, Hupfeld), in the time of the struggle of Josiah with the Egyptian king, Necho (Thenius), of Hezekiah with the Assyrians (Kimchi, Böttcher), of the confederate kings Jehoshaphat and Joram with Moab and Edom, 2 Kings iii. (Hitzig), and in the time of Solomon (De Wette)'!'

What *can* we think of a method of criticism that in the hands of *eleven* Commentators leads to *seven* different results!

To show that the example given is not a solitary one, we subjoin a few more. Ps. xiv. we read in our Bibles is a Psalm of David; but we are assured by Olshausen that it belongs to the Maccabean period, by Ewald that it was written during the Babylonish Captivity; and while Hitzig would make us believe that it comes from Jeremiah, the Dean of Peterborough tells us that 'there is nothing in the Psalm which can lead us to fix its date or authorship precisely.' Ps. xxvii. is also, according to the title, of Davidic authorship. This again Hitzig would persuade us is due to the fertile pen of Jeremiah, while Olshausen finds in it two Psalms, both of

<sup>1</sup> Moll, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*.

the Maccabean date. Ewald for once is in agreement with Olshausen, in so far that he sees in this two Psalms, only he would place them both in the time of the Kingdom, the first half (ver. 1-7) shortly after the reign of David, and the second (ver. 8-16) in the century before the Babylonish Captivity, and De Wette regards the whole poem as 'a general Psalm of lamentation of some Hebrew in later times.' We give one more instance: Ps. xc. that 'Psalm of Eternity,' the 'Prayer of Moses, the man of God.' This is placed by Ewald after the time of David, in the days of the Monarchy; by Köster and Maurer during the Babylonish Captivity; and by Hitzig in the age of the Maccabees! *Verbum sap.* To those of our readers who are tempted to try this method of fixing the date of the Psalms from internal evidence, we can only repeat the often-quoted advice to bachelors about to marry—Don't!

The examples given above sufficiently prove the uncertainty of the method now so much in vogue, and show that if it is to supersede the appeal to the historical evidence of the titles, we are to be left to the caprice of the individual critic, who constantly needs the caution of Bishop Butler, that 'suppositions are not to be looked upon as true, because not incredible,'<sup>1</sup> and the sober reminder of the same judicious writer, that 'mere guess, supposition, and possibility, when opposed to historical evidence, prove nothing, but that historical evidence is not demonstrative.'<sup>2</sup> But we would not be misunderstood. It is not meant to assert that internal evidence is of no value whatever. It *has* its legitimate use, only in the case of the Psalms this is reduced to a minimum (1) by the fact, that in the majority of them we have historical evidence of their dates; and where this is the case, we have no right to proceed in disregard of it, for the office of internal evidence is to decide either in the absence of such historical testimony, or in those cases where it is insufficient or counterbalanced by opposing evidence from without: and (2) by the fact that only *fragmentary* accounts of Jewish history have come down to us. It is often taken for granted that the Psalms must all have been originally composed for some occasions of which we have full details in the series of historical books from Samuel to Esther; but there seems to be no reason why this should be so. Even in the life of David, which is more fully recorded than any other, there must have been countless incidents worthy of giving birth to Psalms of which no traces have been preserved, and in the

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, pt. 1. c. iii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* pt. II. c. vii.

later history of the Kingdom, we have complete evidence that this was the case—evidence that comes to us occasionally from ancient secular historians,<sup>1</sup> but more often in the shape of voices from the tomb, the records of the past, treasures disinterred from the mounds of Mesopotamia, a literature dug out of the earth, and the enigmas of the hieroglyphic, hieratic, and cuneiform characters now for the first time revealed. (3) There is yet another reason that makes us distrustful of taking the verdict of modern critics on the age and occasion of particular Psalms. It is that the language of the Psalms is ordinarily perfectly general, and suits many different occasions equally well. In very few instances is it precise and definite enough to warrant the conclusion that it refers to some particular emergency; more often the expressions used adapt themselves with a marvellous facility to a hundred different occasions. Indeed, it has been acutely remarked that *they would not be the Psalms unless this were so*. The varied experiences of the Church for nearly two thousand years have not yet succeeded in exhausting this wondrous adaptability of language and expression to occasions and scenes widely differing in externals and surroundings, and yet all equally fitted to give birth to the sublimest hymns that ever flowed from the lips of the sweet Psalmist of Israel. 'This is the peculiarity of the Psalter,' says S. Ambrose, 'that everyone can use its words as if they were peculiarly and individually his own.' And who is there that can hear unmoved the Psalms for the eighteenth evening of the month, bearing in mind the passage of Laud's *History of his Troubles* that speaks of his last service in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, after his arrest, and on the eve of his committal to the Tower? 'The Psalms for the day,' he writes, 'gave me much comfort, and were observed by some friends then present as well as myself. And upon the comfort I then received I have every day since (unless some urgent business prevented me), read over both these Psalms,<sup>2</sup> and God willing purpose to do so every day of my life.'<sup>3</sup>

Why, the Psalms in question might have been written by Laud himself!

'O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth: Thou God, to whom vengeance belongeth, shew Thyself.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. The Scythian invasion of Palestine in the time of Joshua, recorded by Herodotus, i. 103-6. Of this there is *no hint whatever* in the historical books of the Old Testament, though it has left tolerably clear traces upon the writings of Jeremiah (i. 13; vi. 1 sq.), and Ezekiel (xxxviii., xxxix).

<sup>2</sup> Pss. xciii., xciv.

<sup>3</sup> Laud's *History of his Troubles*, p. 74.

Arise, Thou judge of the world : and reward the proud after their deserving.

Lord, how long shall the ungodly : how long shall the ungodly triumph?

How long shall all wicked doers speak so disdainfully : and make such proud boasting?

. . . . .

Blessed is the man whom Thou chastenest, O Lord : and teachest him in Thy law ;

That Thou mayest give him patience in time of adversity : until the pit be digged up for the ungodly.

For the Lord will not fail His people : neither will He forsake His inheritance ;

Until righteousness turn again unto judgement : all such as are true in heart shall follow it.

Who will rise up with me against the wicked : or who will take my part against the evil-doers ?

If the Lord had not helped me : it had not failed but my soul had been put to silence.

But when I said, My foot hath slipt : Thy mercy, O Lord, held me up.

In the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart : Thy comforts have refreshed my soul.

Wilt thou have any thing to do with the stool of wickedness : which imagineth mischief as a law ?

They gather them together against the soul of the righteous : and condemn the innocent blood.

But the Lord is my refuge : and my God is the strength of my confidence.

He shall recompense them their wickedness, and destroy them in their own malice : yea, the Lord our God shall destroy them.

Enough has now been said, we trust, to show the inadequacy of internal evidence to give us any certain clue to the dates and occasions of the Psalms, at least as a *general* rule. But it may be urged that though *constructively* this internal evidence is of small value, yet *destructively* it wields enormous powers—powers amply sufficient to overthrow the historical and traditional evidence derived from the titles. We propose, therefore, to advance a few reasons that make us as loth to commit ourselves to its guidance in this wholesale work of destruction as in the more agreeable task of building up, and assigning suitable occasions for the composition of the Psalms.

The reasons that lead the majority of modern critics to reject the inscriptions appear to be three in number, (1) considerations of style, (2) language, and (3) supposed anachronisms. To all such objections there is a general answer that

seems perfectly satisfactory, and yet has been strangely overlooked and neglected. The objections could only be conclusive were it maintained, on the other side, that the Psalms had in every case come down to us in the exact form in which they were originally composed. But, apart from the fact, to which our modern Hymn-books bear such striking testimony, that hymns and Psalms designed for public use are, of all compositions, the most liable to change and alteration, we have convincing proof that among the Jews of old, it was recognised as perfectly legitimate for a later poet to take up, repeat, alter, and adapt the words of an earlier one. The charge of plagiarism is entirely an invention of modern times; and few things are more striking in the ancient Scriptures than the way (we had almost said the wholesale way) in which later writers embody in their works the words of earlier ones with no acknowledgment whatever. This is seen, again and again, in the Prophetical books,<sup>1</sup> and on turning to the Psalter, we find it exemplified there still more remarkably. Thus, the whole of Ps. xiv. appears again in the second book as Ps. liii., having evidently been adapted to suit some later occasion. The latter part of Ps. xl. (ver. 13-17) has been detached from its context, and is presented to us again as a separate Psalm (lxx.); while Ps. cviii. is a composite one, consisting of lvii. 8-12 and lx. 5-12. The xvith chapter of 1 Chronicles presents a yet more striking instance. We find there a composite Psalm, every verse of which is taken from some part or other of the Psalter (viz. ver. 8-22 from Ps. cv. 1-15; ver. 23-33 from Ps. xcvi.; and ver. 34-36 from Ps. cvi. ver. 1, 47, 48).

Since then, there is this convincing evidence of alteration and adaptation in the case of some at least of the Psalms, we think that (the external testimony to the titles being, as it is, overwhelming) we should be justified in setting aside anachronisms, Aramaisms, &c. as insufficient to prove anything concerning the date of the original Psalm: there is always a *possibility*, in some cases a *probability*, that they are due to a

<sup>1</sup> For example, the passage in Micah iv. ver. 1-3, is identical with Is. ii. ver. 2-4, and it is hard to say which Prophet has borrowed from the other. Nahum i. 15 is taken from Is. lii. 7, and Jonah's hymn of thanksgiving, c. ii., teems with quotations from the Psalms (see the *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. vi. p. 583). We would remind our readers that this free use of previously existing materials is characteristic of the writers of the New Testament, as well as of those of the Old Covenant, e.g. much of the Magnificat was evidently suggested by a reminiscence of Hannah's song in 1 Sam. ii. ver. 1-10; and S. Peter in his 2nd Epistle c. ii. borrows largely from the General Epistle of S. Jude.



later editor or compiler making free use of ancient materials and working them up into new forms.<sup>1</sup>

But there is no need to rely entirely upon this argument. The objections brought against the inscriptions may be answered singly as well as *en masse*. We have already summed them up as three in number. On the first of them, the argument from style, we do not propose to dwell at any great length. Criticism from style alone is confessedly *very* precarious. It has been tried, and been found wanting in a number of instances where the material seemed to afford far surer grounds to hope for a successful result than has ever been considered the case with the Psalter. For example, Mosheim<sup>2</sup> and others long ago raised doubts whether the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp were the genuine work of the Saint to whom it was ascribed, urging, that in style it differed considerably from the other six Epistles, which they were willing to accept. Years passed on, and the discovery of the Syriac version dispelled these doubts for ever, the Epistle to Polycarp now standing as one of the three undisputed writings of the Martyr-Bishop of Antioch. A still more striking example is found in the '*Laws*' of Plato: the style, we are told, differs in several respects from that of the other Dialogues, (1) in the want of character, power, and lively illustration; (2) in the frequency of mannerisms; (3) in the form and rhythm of the sentences; and (4) in the use of words. And yet—in spite of this formidable internal evidence—the *Laws* are accepted by the Master of Balliol as the genuine work of the philosopher whose name they have always borne. Most of our readers may know the admirable use that has been made of this example by Dr. Pusey, in his Introduction to Zechariah, but for the sake of some to whom it may be new, we quote a portion:—

'German acuteness has found out reasons why the treatise should not be Plato's. Those reasons are plausible, as most untrue things are. As put together carefully by one who yet attaches no weight to them, they look like a parody of the arguments produced by

<sup>1</sup> For example, in 1 Chr. xvi. 27 we find the word קָרָנָה substituted for תַּפְאֵרֶת of the parallel passage in Ps. xcvi. 6. Now קָרָנָה only occurs elsewhere in Nehem. viii. 10, and in the Chaldee portion of Ezra, vi. 16. Hence it is a natural inference that this late word was substituted by the Chronicler for the original תַּפְאֵרֶת. And if such an alteration can be shown in one instance, there is no reason why we should hesitate to allow the possibility of similar changes elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> *Eccles. Hist.* cent. i. p. ii. c. iii.—'I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style' (the italics are our own).

Germans to take to pieces books of Holy Scripture. *Mutatis mutandis*, they have such an absurdly ludicrous resemblance, that it provokes a smile. Some fifty years ago, there was a tradition at Göttingen, where Heyne had lived, that he attributed the non-reception of the theories as to Homer in England to the English Bishops, who "apprehended that the same principle would be applied to Holy Scripture." Now, for half a century more, both sets of critics have had full scope. The classical sceptics seem to me to have the advantage. Anyone, who knew but a little of the uncritical criticism, applied to the sacred books, could imagine, what a jubilee of triumph it would have occasioned, could such differences as those pointed out between "the Laws" and other treatises of Plato, have been pointed out to detach any book of Holy Scripture from its traditional writer. Yet it is held inadequate by one, of whom an admirer said, that "his peculiar mode of criticism cut the very sinews of belief." . . . The accuracy of the criticisms is not questioned; the statements are not said to be exaggerated; yet they are held invalid. The question then comes with great force to the conscience: "Why, rejecting arguments so forcible as to a treatise of Plato, do I accept arguments very inferior as to such or such a book of the Old or New Testament—certain chapters of Isaiah, or Ecclesiastes, or these chapters of Zechariah, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, or the Revelation of S. John the Divine—except on grounds of theology, not of criticism, and how am I true to myself in rejecting such arguments as to human books and accepting them as to Divine books?"<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the second head, that of language, beyond the general answer given above to all objections on this head as on the other two, we may fairly claim that Hebrew scholars shall be agreed among themselves before they ask us to accept their verdict. And when we find that one Psalm (xvi.), which Ewald assigns to the time of the Captivity, is accepted by Hitzig as the genuine work of David, while another (cx.) which Ewald allows to be Davidic, is consigned by Hitzig to the Maccabean period, we may be excused if we hesitate before accepting the language as an infallible guide; and our hesitation is confirmed by the discovery that 'whilst De Wette, describing Ps. cxli. as a "very original and therefore difficult Psalm," holds it to be one of the oldest in the collection, Maurer, almost on the same grounds, sets it down as belonging to a comparatively late period.'<sup>2</sup>

There only remain the comparatively few (so-called) Aramaisms and Chaldaisms, which are often confidently reckoned on as affording convincing evidence of late date. But even here 'grammatici certant, et adhuc sub judice lis est.' It has never yet been proved (and probably never will

<sup>1</sup> *Minor Prophets*, p. 510.

<sup>2</sup> Perowne, vol. ii. p. 444 (ed. 3).

be) that such forms as the shortened relative (𐤔 for 𐤔𐤕)<sup>1</sup> the *chirek compaginis*,<sup>2</sup> or the (so-called) Aramaic pronominal suffix,<sup>3</sup> afford any clue whatever to the date of the composition in which they occur; and we are glad to see that the Dean of Peterborough speaks of the opinion that 'a tendency to Aramaisms is to be regarded as evidence of a variation merely of dialect, perhaps the dialect of North Palestine,' as 'a supposition which seems not to be wholly without foundation.'<sup>4</sup>

The third head, that of supposed Anachronisms, requires somewhat fuller treatment. In all these cases the burden of proof lies upon those who maintain the existence of such errors; and when we come to examine the so-called proof, we often find that it resolves itself into mere conjecture and supposition on the part of the critic. In English we should not speak of a tent as a 'house' or 'temple,' *therefore*, argues the critic, David cannot have done so; *therefore*, those Psalms wherein the terms 'house of God' and 'temple' occur are falsely attributed to him; and *therefore*, the inscriptions are of no value. Again, the catastrophe of the Babylonish Captivity was so overwhelming that to us it obscures all the previous troubles of the nation, and throws them entirely into the shade. When *we* speak of 'the Captivity,' that in Babylon is always understood by the term; *therefore*, the critic implies, the Hebrews must have meant the same; *therefore*, it is impossible that David could have prayed that God would 'turn the captivity of Judah'; and *therefore*, again the inscriptions are of no value. Once more—the wall of Jerusalem was rebuilt after the Captivity, and in the Book of Nehemiah we hear a great deal about 'building the wall of Jerusalem'; *therefore*, when this expression occurs in the Psalms it must allude to the *rebuilding* of the wall; and *therefore*, Ps. li. (or at least the last two verses of it) belongs to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah; and *therefore*, the inscription assigning it to David is a dim and worthless tradition. In case we should be thought to have exaggerated, we subjoin a few specimens of argument from '*The Psalms, chronologically arranged by*

<sup>1</sup> On this see the exhaustive and convincing remarks of Dr. Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, p. 250; and on the subject of Aramaisms generally, *ib.* 249–251, 401, 402.

<sup>2</sup> This occurs in Ps. cx. 4: a Psalm which even Ewald allows to be David's.

<sup>3</sup> See Ps. ciii. 3. The forms occur in some other Psalms, generally set down as late ones; but they are also found in 2 Kings iv. 1–7, a fact that is highly perplexing to those who treat them as evidence of date.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. ii. p. 431. Cf. Jennings, vol. ii. p. 174.

Four Friends,' who are by far the gravest offenders in this respect. Of Ps. xxvii. we are told that 'the fourth verse in its present form must have been written after the Temple was built' (p. 68); while in the introduction to Ps. xxiii. we are gravely told that 'the mention of "God's house" in this, as in the twenty-seventh Psalm, requires that both alike, at least in their present shape, should be assigned to a period subsequent to the building of the Temple' (p. 70). On p. 439 we are informed that 'internal criticism has shewn that many of the existing superscriptions are unquestionably erroneous;' and as specimens, it is mentioned that 'it is impossible to conceive that David could write in the fourteenth Psalm, "When Jehovah turneth the *captivity* of His people, then shall Jacob rejoice," or that at any period of his life he could have used the words contained in the last two verses of the fifty-first Psalm.' Still more curious is the information conveyed in the introduction to this fifty-first Psalm (p. 194):— 'At the time when this Psalm was written, the rites of the ceremonial law, while still suggesting the metaphors of the Psalmist, have fallen into abeyance, for the city and Temple have been overthrown.' One is really inclined to wonder whether the 'Four Friends' have some secret source of information, some ancient document describing in full the circumstances under which the Psalms were composed; but no—they refer us to verses 18 and 19 of the Psalm itself, as the source of this remarkable piece of information! We would gently suggest that the verses in question contain no mention whatever of the *temple*, and that the Psalmist himself must surely have been unaware that 'the rites of the ceremonial law had fallen into abeyance' when he wrote the sixteenth verse, 'Thou desirest no sacrifice, *else would I give it Thee*.'<sup>1</sup>

Let us turn from theories to facts. With regard to the expressions 'temple,' and 'house of God,' they are, as we are glad to see, noted both by the Dean of Peterborough and by Mr. Jennings, equally applicable to the Tabernacle as to the Temple of Solomon. (1) The word rendered *temple* (מִקְדָּשׁ) properly means *a palace*, in which sense it occurs three times in the Psalter (xlv. 9, 16; cxliv. 12), and frequently in other books (e.g. 1 Kings xxi. 1, '*the palace* of Ahab'; 2 Kings xx. 18, '*the palace* of the King of Babylon'<sup>2</sup>). Now the

<sup>1</sup> On this verse Dr. Kay aptly quotes from Hammond:—'The truth is . . . the Mosaic law allows no reconciliation, no sacrifice, for such wilful sins' (Heb. x.).

<sup>2</sup> Other instances are Prov. xxx. 28; Is. xiii. 22; xxxix. 7; Dan. i. 4; Nahum ii. 7.

Tabernacle in its day, as the seat of Jehovah's presence, was quite as much His *palace* as was the Temple in later years, and therefore it need excite no surprise that the term should be applied to it, not only in Davidic Psalms, but (as is unquestionably the case) in 1 Sam. i. 9, and iii. 3. (2) Nor does the expression 'house of God' by any means necessarily denote a building of solid masonry, as the 'Four Friends' seem to imagine, for the same word *house* (בית) is applied to the *tent* of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 27; cf. xviii. 1); to the *fir trees*, as the home of the stork (Ps. civ. 17); and to the *place* where Jacob first rested on his flight towards Haran (Gen. xxviii. 17), 'How dreadful is this *place*! this is none other than the *house* of God, and this is the gate of heaven'; cf. verse 22:—'This stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's *house*.' Further, the term is as a matter of fact applied to the Tabernacle in *eleven passages*, outside the Psalter, where no one can by any possibility doubt its meaning. The passages are the following:—Exod. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26; Deut. xxiii. 18; Josh. vi. 24; ix. 23; Judges xviii. 31; xix. 18; 1 Sam. i. 7, 20; iii. 15; and 2 Sam. xii. 24. We commend them to the notice of the 'Four Friends,' in the hope that a careful study of them may induce them to modify their language should another edition of their work ever be called for.

We pass on to consider the expression 'turn the captivity.' It is found in the Psalter some four times in all—viz., xiv. 7; liii. 7; lxxxv. 2; and cxxvi. 4. In the last of these passages there can be no reasonable doubt that it *does* refer to the Babylonish Captivity, and it *may* have the same reference in Ps. lxxxv., though the expressions there used would equally well apply to the narrative contained in 2 Chr. xxviii. 5–20.<sup>1</sup> But Pss. xiv. and liii. are both attributed to David. What then are we to say of the verse, 'When the Lord turneth the captivity of His people: then shall Jacob rejoice, and Israel shall be glad'? Simply this, that the expression is a proverbial one, suited to any period of national depression, for it means no more than *restore to prosperity*, and has not necessarily the slightest connexion with the Babylonish Captivity. The first passage in our Bibles where it occurs is Deut. xxx. 3, 'The Lord thy God will turn thy captivity,' but this, we shall perhaps be told, is a passage of late date, and therefore not to be relied on. We pass on, therefore, to the next occurrence

<sup>1</sup> Though the actual word *captivity* (שבי) does not occur in this passage, yet the kindred word שבי is found in verse 17, and the verb שבה is used no less than three times (verses 5, 8, 17).

of the expression, Job xlii. 10, 'The Lord turned the captivity of Job.' Here there can by no possibility be the remotest allusion to the Babylonish Captivity; and as we never heard of Job's incarceration in a dungeon, we have no hesitation in setting down the expression as a proverbial one, not necessarily to be understood literally; and we are confirmed in our decision by finding that Ezekiel has adopted the same phrase in reference to the cities of the plain, 'When I shall bring again the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then I will bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of thee' (Ezek. xvi. 53). We conclude, therefore, that there is nothing in the expression inconsistent with the Davidic authorship of those Psalms in which it occurs.

So far our criticisms on the supposed anachronisms in the Psalms have referred mainly to the work of the 'Four Friends.' In their explanation, however, of the remaining phrase, 'build the walls of Jerusalem,' they have the support of the far abler Commentaries of the Dean of Peterborough and Mr. Jennings: the former of whom believes that the last two verses of Ps. li. 'bear evident marks of having been added at a date subsequent to the exile,' and says that 'otherwise the whole Psalm must be of that date';<sup>1</sup> while the latter expresses himself to the same effect: 'If these verses be indeed a portion of the original composition, the prayer for the building (*i.e.* rebuilding), of Jerusalem is conclusive against the Davidic authorship of the Psalm.'<sup>2</sup> Now, so far as the actual word בָּנִי is concerned, there can be no question that it *may* mean rebuild, but on the other side, there can be no question that it *may* also mean build, and therefore the notes in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and in Dr. Kay's admirable little book, pointing out that at the time of David's fall the walls of Jerusalem had yet to be built,<sup>3</sup> would serve to show that the prayer in question is *not* conclusive against the Davidic authorship of the Psalm. But there is another interpretation of the phrase that seems to us never to have had justice done to it. It is, that the terms used are figurative, and that the words are simply a prayer for God's protection, and for the establishment of the city. This interpretation is noticed by the Dean of Peterborough only to be rejected, but there seems to be much that might be urged in its favour. (1) The phrase 'to build a house'

<sup>1</sup> *The Psalms*, vol. i. p. 423.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 224.

<sup>3</sup> 'That the walls of Jerusalem had yet to be built, literally, appears from 1 Kings iii. 1; ix. 15, 19.'—Kay, *cf. Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iv. p. 290.



(בנה בית) is a not uncommon one for expressing (a) the foundation of a family, or (b) God's protection and support whether it be of an individual or of a line of men. In the former sense, the words occur in Deut. xxv. 9, and Ruth iv. 11<sup>1</sup> (cf. the similar use of the verb in Gen. xvi. 2; xxx. 3), and with the latter meaning in 1 Sam. ii. 35, of the faithful priest to be raised up, 'I will build him a sure house,' and 1 Kings xi. 38, 'I will be with thee, and build thee a sure house, as I built for David,' cf. Ps. lxxxix. 4, 'Thy seed will I establish for ever: and build up (בנה) thy throne to all generations.' (2) The word 'build' without the addition of 'house' is used to express the ideas of prosperity, establishment, and security, e.g. Job xxii. 23, 'If thou return to the Almighty, thou shalt be *built up* (בנה)'; Ps. xxviii. 5, 'Because they regard not the works of the LORD, nor the operations of His hands, He shall destroy them, and not *build them up* (בנה)'; Mal. iii. 15, 'They that work wickedness are *set up* (Heb. בנה; A. V. Marg. *built*).' The word is used metaphorically again and again by the prophet Jeremiah (i. 10; xviii. 9; xxiv. 6; xxxi. 4, 28; xxxiii. 7), and in the following passages the usage of the term seems to approach very closely to the figurative sense for which we are pleading in Ps. li. Micah iii. 9, 10, 'Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob, and princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment, and pervert all equity. They *build up* (בנה) Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity.' Hab. ii. 12, 'To him that *buildeth* a town with blood, and stablisheth a city with iniquity';<sup>2</sup> and the figurative sense suits the context best in Micah vii. 11, 'In the day that thy walls are to be *built*, in that day shall the decree be far removed.'<sup>3</sup> (3) Thirdly, we notice that similar figures are employed by the Prophets to denote God's protection of His people, e.g., by Isaiah (xxvi. 1), 'Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks,' and by Zechariah (ii. 5), 'For I, saith the LORD, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.' (4) And lastly, we claim the *parallelism* as being in favour of the figurative sense, the

<sup>1</sup> A somewhat different, though still figurative, use of the words may be seen in Prov. ix. 1; xiv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In this passage the *parallelism* should not be overlooked, *buildeth* in one clause answering to *stablisheth* in the other.

<sup>3</sup> However we may interpret this passage, there can be no question that it was written about a hundred years *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore it is sufficient to prove that there is no necessity for Ps. li. 18 to be placed *after* that event. We should note, however, that the word for 'walls' is different in the two passages.

clauses answering to one another in this way, three words being given to each :—

Do - good | in - Thy - good - pleasure | to - Zion :  
Build - Thou | the - walls - of | Jerusalem.

We trust that sufficient has now been said to show that there is absolutely no reason for rejecting the traditional view that David is the author of the whole of Ps. li. Our readers must choose between the various explanations of the prayer, 'build Thou the walls;' but to us it seems that the figurative meaning is by far the most probable;<sup>1</sup> and we cannot conclude without a protest against the extreme literalism that is so marked a feature in our modern Commentaries. Words are taken *au pied de la lettre*, and statistical exactness is demanded in poetry that comes to us from a nation whose very prose might almost be said to consist of metaphor and hyperbole. In no other case is a poet supposed to weigh his words with the exactness of a logician or mathematician; and yet this is what men look for from the Psalmist. Only think what havoc this kind of criticism would make if applied to one of our modern Hymn-books! We should then have the critic of the future gravely asserting that the 'Rock of Ages' was composed by Toplady, in a state of nudity, or that the hymn beginning, 'Soldiers of Christ arise, And put your armour on,' was not the work of Charles Wesley, to whom it has been attributed, because in his day, the troops of his Majesty's Army had ceased to wear armour!

Admirable as are the notes on the Psalter in the *Speaker's Commentary*, they are, it seems to us, often disfigured by this tendency to over-literalism. For example, in the note on Ps. lxix. ver. 1-2: 'Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me,' we read that the Psalm 'is supposed by some to refer to Jeremiah's being let down into a pit or cistern, *but we are expressly told that there was no water in that.*' And, what if the pit was dry? Yet there is surely an illusion to this incident in Jeremiah's life in Lam. iii. 53-4: 'They have cut off my life in the dungeon, and cast a stone upon me. *Waters went over my head*; then I said, I am cut off.' In

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps accidental, but it is worth noticing that the word for 'walls' in the Psalm is in the plural (חומות), whereas in Nehemiah the singular occurs *thirty* times, while the plural is only found *twice* in the whole book, viz. ii. 13 (where the LXX. and Vulgate have the sing.) and iv. i. (A. V. iv. 7).

both passages, the expressions are figurative, and the fact that the cistern was one in which there was no water proves nothing either way concerning the authorship of Ps. lxix. There is more point in the remark made curiously enough in the first half of the very same note already quoted: 'This expression appears to be metaphorical, it occurs in other Psalms, especially in those attributed by all critics to David.'

To take another instance. Everybody knows the sort of language used by David in the Penitential Psalms, language which taken in the letter implies that he was suffering from a severe illness, *e.g.*:—

'Have mercy upon me, O LORD, for I am weak: O LORD, heal me, for my bones are vexed.' Ps. vi. 2.

'My strength faileth because of mine iniquity, and my bones are consumed.' xxxi. 10.

'There is no soundness in my flesh because of Thine anger; neither is there any rest in my bones because of my sin.

My wounds stink and are corrupt, because of my foolishness.

My loins are filled with a loathsome disease; and there is no soundness in my flesh.' xxxviii. 3-5-7.

Now, all these passages are taken by Canon Cook and his colleagues, as if David was describing his symptoms to a medical man. We are told that these Psalms were composed 'in a season of extreme depression, *probably when the Psalmist was dangerously sick*,' (p. 182), and we are referred to a note on Job xxx. 17, which tells us that 'leprosy eats away the flesh and nerves, and then corrodes the bones, so that the limbs fall off piecemeal.' But it has always seemed to us that the true key to the language of David quoted above is given by Ps. li. ver. 7, 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.' Was not the leprosy from which David was suffering a moral one, and a moral one only? and is there not sound sense as well as humour in the remark of Bishop Lowth:—

'Some who were but little acquainted with the genius of the Hebrew poetry, have pretended to inquire into the nature of the disease with which the poet was affected; not less absurdly, in my opinion, than if they had perplexed themselves to discover in what river he was plunged when he complains that the deep waters had gone over his soul.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The language of the Prophets is instructive, as they often describe their sufferings and the calamities of the nation under the same figure of a sore disease, *e.g.* Isa. i. 5, 6; Jer. xv. 18; xxx. 12-17; and for the mention of the bones, see Lam. i. 13; iii. 4; and notice the absence of all allusion to the symptoms of the actual disease in Hezekiah's hymn, Isa. xxxviii. 10-20.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures on Hebrew Poetry*, p. 84.

Little more remains to be said. We have endeavoured to show (1) that there is strong historical evidence in favour of the titles of the Psalms, and no counter historical evidence to be brought against them; and (2) that the arguments from internal evidence that have led the majority of modern critics to discard them are wholly insufficient to bear the weight that has been laid upon them. If we have succeeded in making good these assertions, we may claim that the Titles have a right to be regarded as an integral portion of the text of the Old Testament; but we would point out that there is still room for different interpretations of them. The question is still an open one whether the *lamed auctoris* in every case denotes the actual composer of the Psalm, and whether *Asaph* invariably means the great Precentor of that name in David's reign; and it is yet a fair subject for discussion whether the fact that a Psalm is assigned to such and such an event necessarily implies that it was composed at that particular time any more than the lines on 'The Solitude of Alexander Selkirk' imply the presence of William Cowper on a desert island, or compel us to identify him with the man into whose mouth the verses are put.

We conclude by reminding our readers of the words of 'the Eagle of Meaux,' himself no mean critic of the Holy Scriptures:—'*Qui titulos non uno modo intelligant, video esse quam plurimos: qui de titulorum auctoritate dubitant, ex antiquis omnino neminem.*'<sup>1</sup>

---

#### ART. V.—HOMER ILLUSTRATED BY RECENT DISCOVERY.

1. *Troy and its Remains*. By Dr. H. SCHLIEMANN. (London, 1875.)
2. *Mycenæ*. By Dr. H. SCHLIEMANN. (London, 1877.)

SCHOLARSHIP and its cognate culture have struck so deep a root that this latter has shot down to the kingdom of night and broken the rest of the nameless ones who lived 'before Agamemnon.' Like the earlier examples of Egypt, Rhodes, Caria, and Assyria, a list of sites too long to enu-

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet, *Dissert.* § 28, quoted in *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 954.

merate, including Ephesus, Hissarlik, Cyprus, Mycenæ, and Olympia, are now giving in their tale; and 'the cry is still, they come.' We purpose regarding some few of these, and especially that of Mycenæ, not archæologically, with the view of fixing their date and value in the history of human progress, but illustratively as regards ancient literature.

The moment that any such discovery as those to which we have referred takes place, the eyes of all who are capable of the effort are instantly turned chiefly on two records: the Homeric Poems and the periegetic memoranda of Pausanias. The former are the first-ripened harvest of secular humanity; the latter are the records of the last gleaner in the same early field. We propose at present chiefly to deal with the first, referring incidentally to the latter as occasion may require.

The artistic feature that floats on the surface of Homeric poetry is its similes, among which the most lively and typical are those which deal with animal life. But not in simile alone is Homer's poetical energy in favour of animals expressed. The immortal or heaven-given<sup>1</sup> coursers of more than one hero, their tears and human sympathies,<sup>2</sup> their power, in one instance, of speech and prophecy;<sup>3</sup> the favourite dogs of Patroclus<sup>4</sup> slaughtered on his pyre, as if to attend his shade; the similar pair which form the sole retinue of Telemachus on a state occasion;<sup>5</sup> the hounds that detect the goddess's presence, invisible to their master;<sup>6</sup> the dogs and mules that are the first victims of a pestilence aimed by an avenging deity at man;<sup>7</sup> the touching episode of the noble hound Argus,<sup>8</sup> who alone penetrates the disguise of magic transformation which baffled every human eye, and whose sagacity is fatal to himself; the beautiful freshness of the hunting scene,<sup>9</sup> in which the young Odysseus received the scar that marked him for life—all these show the same poetic factor which is powerful in simile raised to a higher power by incident. Above all, the introduction among the groups on the shield of Achilles of two purely animal pieces,<sup>10</sup> or in which the human element is a pure accessory to the animal, and the exquisite balance between slaughter and security, energy and repose, which the pair exhibit, show us how deeply the poet was enamoured of the theme he handles here. As he divides his human compartments between the works of peace and war, so he preserves the like contrast in his studies from

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xvi. 150, 867; v. 265 fol.; xx. 220-9.

<sup>2</sup> xvii. 437-41; xxiii. 283-4.

<sup>3</sup> *Od.* ii. 11 *et al.*

<sup>4</sup> *Od.* xvii. 300 foll.

<sup>5</sup> xix. 407-15.

<sup>6</sup> xvi. 162.

<sup>7</sup> xix. 429 foll.

<sup>8</sup> xxiii. 174.

<sup>9</sup> *Il.* i. 50.

<sup>10</sup> *Il.* xviii. 573 foll.

the pasture and the fold. Yet, with exquisite truth of feeling, in the human subjects peace predominates; in the animal pieces the more sustained note is one of strife and blood. His two lions here, like those at the famous gate of Mycenæ, are evidently 'masters of the situation;' the men set on the hounds, who bay at a safe distance. Then comes, in three lines, the companion picture of folded flocks, with sheep-cote, shed, and pen appurtenant.

Again, we have the belt (τελάμων) of Herakles, a marvel of its kind, inwrought with wondrous forms (θέσκελα ἔργα), which are found to be, first a list of wild and fierce animals—bear, and boar, and lion—then a series of combats, massacres, and homicides. Here it is remarkable that the beasts seem to lead (*Od.* xi. 610-2). Thus in simile, in incident, and in art, we find the same note struck again and again. If animals could turn critics, the *Iliad* would be their favourite poem. No poet has ever shown such a hearty love of man's mute comrades, or so deeply interwoven that love with the master-passions of strife, sorrow, and devoted affection. It is as though the degraded sympathies which led the Egyptian to enshrine the repulsive forms of crocodile and monkey, blossomed, in the clearer atmosphere of the Greek mind, into a delighted appreciation of animal nobleness. But, unless we are greatly mistaken, this love of animal life and movement is not a pure individuality of the poet's; it marks the period at which and the conditions under which he composed. While he triumphs in word-pictures drawn from it, his human images have often the scantiest pictorial embellishment, and what embellishment they have falls constantly into the fixed forms of 'epic common-place.' More conspicuously is this to be seen in the absence of emotional play of feature and of variety of mien in his personages. On great occasions he seems indeed to rise into a higher sphere of feature-study; and the malignant passion of Agamemnon,<sup>1</sup> the abject terror of Dolón,<sup>2</sup> the 'grim-visaged smile' of Ajax,<sup>3</sup> the 'tearful laughter' and agonised consternation of Andromache,<sup>4</sup> show us that the feature-record of the more masterful emotions had not escaped him. But we may look a long way in either poem through a wide extent of exciting scenes and animated dialogue without anything more than the constant recurrence of the stern look, the seizure of pale fear, the silently shaken head with mind

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* i. 104-5.

<sup>2</sup> vii. 212.

<sup>3</sup> x. 374-6.

<sup>4</sup> vi. 484; xxii. 461-2, 466-8.



brooding mischief, the nodding brows, the smile.<sup>1</sup> Even in the outward form of man and woman there is an absence of descriptive width of range and discrimination of touch.

On the other hand, in action and feeling, and all the intrinsic essence of character, the poet shows an exuberance of resource which is the very opposite of this feebleness. To say nothing of the more imposing forms of heroic life in either sex, the secondary characters, such as Menelaüs, Idomeneus, Alcinoüs, Eumæus, and Melanthius, Arêtê and Euryclea, all have their distinct impressiveness and spontaneous personality. We feel their separate moral type the moment they enter upon the scene. In external portraiture they are equally indistinct, and so for the most part are the grander personages themselves. Of the Greek host Achilles is most beautiful. But we have no image which arrests us; and the rare beauty of Euphorbus is paid off in a simile.<sup>2</sup> Hero and heroine are alike godlike in form, or are compared with some deity in respect of some personal attribute. All are beautiful and largely moulded, some more beautiful and larger than others, the gods most beautiful and largest of all. Thus two of Priam's daughters are each in turn said to be 'the fairest (*εἶδος ἀπλόστη*) of all,'<sup>3</sup> while two heroes of the Greek host are similarly each the most handsome, next to Achilles.<sup>4</sup> Thus the same epithet—'substantial,' shall we render it?—is applied to the 'hand' of the warrior in the shock of combat,<sup>5</sup> and to that of the lady in her bower. With the same 'dear' or 'fond hands' the hero in his chariot picks up the reins from the battle-field, and the saviour-goddess Inô receives back her magic scarf.<sup>6</sup> There is hardly a trace of this monotony when the poet is dealing with the brute. There he is unsurpassed in freshness and vigour.<sup>7</sup> Every attribute of his four-footed or winged studies is discri-

<sup>1</sup> ὑποδρα ἰδὼν, *Il.* ii. 245 *et al.*; ὑπὸ χλωρὸν δέος ἤρει or εἶλε, vii. 479 *et al.*; ἀκίων κίνησε κάρη κακὰ βυσσοδομύων, *Od.* xviii. 465, cf. viii. 273 *et al.*; ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε, i.e. ἐπένευσεν ὀφρύσι, *Il.* i. 528 *et al.*; μειδύων, vii. 212; xxiii. 786.

<sup>2</sup> xvii. 50-60. The personal comeliness of Odysseus as enhanced by Pallas includes 'close-curl'd hair, like the hyacinth flower'—an unusually graphic touch of personal description; but of his general appearance we read only that the goddess 'made him seem taller and more robust.'—*Od.* vi. 229-31.

<sup>3</sup> iii. 124; xiii. 365-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Il.* ii. 671-5; *Od.* xi. 469-70.

<sup>5</sup> χειρὶ παχείῃ.—*Il.* iii. 376 *et al.*; cf. *Od.* xxi. 6.

<sup>6</sup> χεῖρασαι or χειρὶ φίλῃσιν, *Il.* xvii. 620; cf. *Od.* v. 462.

<sup>7</sup> We find fixed epithets, as κύνας ἀργοί, βόες εὐρυμέτωποι, λῆς ἡγέμευος, and the like, but that is about all; and fixed epithets in Homer pervade all things, animate and inanimate, human and divine.

minated at once—the most expressive with the greatest keenness. The single line which describes the boar charging his assailant home—

‘With back all bristle-crested and eyes that glare out fire’<sup>1</sup>—

how wonderfully effective is it, and what a contrast it offers with the line a hundred times staled, which describes the human warrior ‘brandishing on high and hurling forth his lance of lengthy shade.’

Thus for Homeric mastery in one department there is a compensation of weakness in another. The superabundance in particular of similitic energy is the direct measure of the poet’s defective sensibility as regards the traits of impassioned or emotional humanity. And the true account of this, we believe, is to be found in the fact that art-culture had trained the poet’s eye and expressional power to a full mastery over the brute creation, but had as yet placed no equal resources within his reach as regards man. As regards one wide department of pictorial effect, viz. colour, Homer must be allowed to be one of the least expressive and probably least receptive of poets. Mr. Gladstone has devoted a very careful essay to the subject in his *Homeric Studies*, vol. iii. iv. *Aoidos: Colour in Homer*; and although we think he presses the negative argument a little too hard as regards some highly descriptive words of colour,<sup>2</sup> yet he succeeds in establishing generally a great vagueness in their use, and concludes on the whole, we think fairly enough, that ‘the organ of colour and its impressions were but partially developed among the Greeks of the heroic age.’ With regard to the pathos of musical sound Homer is feebler still, as compared with Pindar, for instance. He had no materials out of which to construct such a simile as the Shakespearian—

‘Each under each matched like a peal of bells;’

or as that of Milton—

‘As in an organ, from one blast of wind

To many a row of pipes the sound-board breathes.’

But these departments of colour and music are beside our present purpose, save as illustrations of defects arising from the lack of cultivation at the poet’s period. It remains, then, that the mirror of animal simile is the natural makeshift of a poet who feels the expressiveness of humanity, but has no

<sup>1</sup> φρίξας εὖ λοφίην, πῦρ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς, *Od.* xix. 446.

<sup>2</sup> Such as *ιοδνεφές*, *ίοις*, *ἀλιπόρφυρος*.

camera of art in which to catch its fully moulded image. Thus Odysseus is found among the slaughtered suitors, 'bespattered with blood and gore like a lion,' &c. How he looked we are left to feel as best we can, for the poet 'rides off,' so to speak, on the lion. Indeed, until Greece assumed the chisel—probably early in the sixth century B.C.<sup>1</sup>—the rigorous study of external humanity had hardly begun.<sup>2</sup> And this defect could not but tell upon the poet, for it is the presence of the ideal which enables us to differentiate the actual, by fixing a standard and by training observation. And that object of his study was sure to suffer most from this defect in which the dominion of mind over matter is most complete, viz. in the human face and form. The brute creation suffers little comparatively from the absence of idealisation, and inanimate nature perhaps not at all. Thus, if no ideal standard of animal form was absolutely reached, an adequately vigorous and graceful copy of actual nature was likely to suffice. This latter, we see, had been realised at Mycenæ—whether by native or imported artists is of less importance—and this it is which gives to the art-treasures resulting from recent discovery a highly illustrative value in respect to Homer. The archaic samples of Mycenæ in particular show that epoch in the history of art at which the artist had fairly compassed animal delineation, but lagged far behind the mastery of the human form. How many centuries may lie between their actual date and that of the *Iliad* may never be exactly known, but both they and it belong to the same general period, and come under the same characteristic law.

The result is that we have from Mycenæ a series of designs which closely reflect the Homeric animal simile, and have the same *rationale* underlying them. The same sort of scenes or groups are fixed upon. Lions in pursuit or in repose, stags, oxen, swans, eagles, the cicada, the cuttlefish, whether moulded, or in *repoussée*, or in intaglio.

In the women's tomb at Mycenæ was a golden ornament showing for device an ox attacked by two lions. We have the very same picture in the Homeric shield of Achilles.<sup>3</sup> We

<sup>1</sup> Thus the body of the statue of Apollo at Amyclæ, which may probably have been wrought in the seventh century, was a bronze column, with human head, feet, and hands; showing exactly how the typical Athenian Hermes originated. Pausan. III. xix. 2.

<sup>2</sup> In Chios and the Asiatic mainland there were earlier efforts, but pre-lusive and tentative only. But until the Athenian school of sculpture and painting of the late fifth century the means of æsthetic culture, as the world has since known them, did not exist.

<sup>3</sup> *Il.* xviii. 579 foll.

feel sure that if the assortment were larger we could almost match the similes or their members individually. We see the same attitude of eager and successful attention fixed on the brute creation in the poet and in the artist; we find the same inadequacy of grasp when it is turned on man.

Æsop's fables, again, illustrate the same period in respect to ethical observation. Here the simile and the thing compared run into each other, like the two sides of a stereoscope, and give a moral solidity on which the imagination fastens. The simple artifice consists in investing with such moral traits as lie on the surface of human nature such creatures as are sufficiently familiar and suitable vehicles of them. Thus the fox is the type of cunning, the lion of courage, and the like. And philosophy in its advanced forms has so feeble a hold on the many, that these fables are sure to be popular while the world lasts. For children they have an especial charm. They spring from the infancy of humanity, and therefore speak sympathetically to infancy in all ages.

With the one wide exception of the religious element, we see the same general aspect of social life in Mycenæ and when Homer sang. Instead of the Olympian theomorphism, we find indications of brute worship. Whatever denomination be fixed on the objects called 'cow-idols' or 'Hera-idols' by Dr. Schliemann, they certainly are not human. A number of them, e.g. some on *Mycenæ*, p. 106, have heads like geese or snakes, while others more resemble the type of the familiar hook-handled umbrella. One on p. 104 has a long stilted neck like a deer, another on p. 101 more resembles a duck. There is no adequate reason for referring all to one intended type, any more than for referring all the idols of Egypt to the form of the Apis bull. It was a bold and to a great extent a successful prophecy of Dr. Schliemann, when, on digging up what he thought was the 'owl-headed Athênê' at Hissarlik, he ventured to say that, if he went to explore Mycenæ, he should expect to find the 'cow-headed Hera.' It is the more remarkable because we cannot say we believe he has proved the existence of a single owl-headed form amongst the Hissarlik collection; while, unless his illustrations in his *Mycenæ* are unusually imaginative, he has found there an object or class of objects to which the supposed 'cow-headed Hera' and 'owl-headed Athênê' seem alike to have a very close relation. The interpretation which he fixes on these two obscure goddess-epithets seems very likely to be true, and is not the less valuable, although it is less easily provable, because he was led to it by an original error. The owl-head,

which looks suspicious as we glance over the representations in *Troy and its Remains*, vanishes at once when we come face to face with the originals, as the British public had lately the opportunity of doing at South Kensington. As regards the 'cow-headed Hera,' the bovine type of some at any rate of the smaller images figured in the *Mycenæ* seems unquestionable; while that of the large cow-head, ox-head, or bull's head, of bronze plated with silver and gilded at the mouth, and with golden horns, speaks of course for itself. It is indifferent to our argument whether it be bull, ox, or cow. The fact of Mycenæ being the well-known site of Hera worship in historic times, and of Mycenæ being named as one of her favourite cities by Homer, leads us to seek an interpretation of the poet's fixed epithet for her on the spot. This is furnished by the zoömorphie idol forms, as they almost certainly are, brought to light by Dr. Schliemann, and is confirmed by the many testimonies and analogies in ancient literature and legend alleged by him in his note on the subject, *Mycenæ*, pp. 19-22. It seems likely then that the *Ἡρῆ βοῶπις* of the poet was originally 'cow-headed,' but that when, under the influence of Olympian anthropomorphism, the original hieratic type was lost, the epithet remained current. And if this be true of the *βοῶπις* epithet, it is a strong presumption in favour of the *γλαυκῶπις* having the same solution, even although there be not a single beak traceable in the whole Hissarlik collection.

But to pass from the hieratic question, we find at Mycenæ the same articles of value in general esteem to which the Homeric Poems testify—a large class of many groups—which makes the evidence the stronger. The social atmosphere seems permeated by the same habits. Besides the warlike articles, which will receive a more detailed notice further on, we find at Mycenæ splendid cups of varied shape, vast size, and sumptuous material, copper tripods, caldrons, and bath-vessels of various make and dimensions, a lavish outlay of gold in weapon-mounting and decorative accoutrements, necklaces, bracelets, earrings, and brooch-pins of massive form and rich device, every one of which is a social feature of Homeric life. There are very few articles, if we except those of perishable kind, mentioned in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which do not receive illustration from either the Mycenæan or the Hissarlik treasures, or both. The great exception is the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* xviii., for analogues to which we must look elsewhere. Many indeed have received adequate illustration before, and will claim a briefer notice.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the tombs found are those of princes of a wealthy and presumably powerful line, who ruled earlier than the immigration of the Heraclid Dorians. They seem to have occupied that social elevation which Homer ascribes to the 'princes whom Zeus has reared,' if we may judge by the mass of value expended on their sepulture. We question very much whether there was, before Dr. Schliemann dug, so much gold coin in circulation in the whole of the Morea as the bullion found in the tombs would represent. We seem to see the ascendancy of the hero-king over his subjects expressed in the potent factor, gold, scattered broadcast on his mortal remains. When was ever death so larded with solid wealth as here? Animal victims only appear consumed on the pyre of Patroclus. There is nothing in it of the sumptuous destructiveness which commits to the flames, or locks up in the bowels of the earth, articles of current use and high esteem. Such are, in the funeral games of the hero, bestowed with more discernment on his living friends as prizes competed for in honour of his memory. A golden (*i.e.* probably gilded) coffin is mentioned as receiving Hector's bones, and Achilles speaks of a single golden urn (*ἀμφιφορεὺς*) as destined to receive the remains of Patroclus and himself.<sup>1</sup> At Mycenæ we find the gold in the form of visors and breast-plates, but no trace of any coffin. Further, the Homeric pyre is consumed in the open, and the bones picked out from the ashes for preservation. At Mycenæ the bodies, if Dr. Schliemann is right, were burned in pits, three and five together, so far as to consume the flesh and leave the bones; while in some remarkable instances they were merely desiccated, leaving the frame dried and scorched, but entire in all its solid elements, to be then crushed flat by weight from above.

We proceed to notice in detail the principal Homeric decorations, weapons, utensils, &c., which appear to be illustrated by the remains found at Mycenæ, Hissarlik, and Cyprus.

The sacred (*στέμματα*) crowns or chaplets of Apollo are used for supplicatory purposes by his priest Chryses in the opening passage of the *Iliad*. There is no detail as to their material or fashion, but, as they are presented 'on the top of a golden sceptre,'<sup>2</sup> like the traditional olive bough or wreath, of which we have such frequent notice in the tragedians, and as they are plainly part of the sacred equipment of the shrine, we shall probably be right in supposing them also to be of

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xxiv. 795; xxiii. 91-2; cf. *Od.* xxiv. 74. The line, *Il.* xxiii. 92, was impugned by the ancient critics, being supposed by them to be founded on this from the *Odyssey*.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* i. 14-5.



gold, to which the name Chrysê itself (*χρυσήν*) points. The beautiful and elaborately patterned crowns of golden *repoussée* work found in the Mycenæan tombs, of which No. 281 is a typical specimen (see for others p. 247), may be cited as possible parallels. In the tomb of three each skeleton had five such diadems of thin gold plate, each 19½ in. long, with a maximum breadth of 4 in., but narrowing towards the ends. In the women's tomb the specimen above referred to as No. 281 was even larger, measuring 25 in. in length by 11 in. in breadth, and profusely ornamented with large shield-like rosettes. Dr. Schliemann names some Cypriote images of Aphrodîtê in terra cotta and marble, in the British Museum, as having similar diadems on the head. The diadem being assumed to be of gold may explain the epithets 'golden' and 'well-crowned' bestowed by Homer on this goddess.<sup>1</sup>

The 'sceptre' of the Homeric king or of the 'herald,' his official, is a prominent object in Homer, and is the oldest known symbol of sovereignty.<sup>2</sup> The sacred one produced by the priest, as mentioned above, is called 'golden,' meaning probably 'gold-mounted.'<sup>3</sup> So is that grasped by Odysseus,<sup>4</sup> and so in other instances. That of Achilles is 'pierced with golden studs.'<sup>5</sup> A similar sceptre is borne by Tiresias as the seer, and by Minos as the judge of the dead.<sup>6</sup> That of Agamemnon is an heirloom given by Zeus to Tantalus and his successors. Its material is not noticed, but it is called 'ever imperishable,'<sup>7</sup> which epithet is probably to be explained by the perpetual demise, which the poet traces as far as the King of Men.<sup>8</sup> The remains of one or more sceptres of conspicuous richness are figured by Dr. Schliemann. Thus we find three tubes of gold containing the remains of wood, regarded probably as those of such a sceptre; and No. 451, a magnificent golden cylinder of quatrefoiled open work, the quatrefoils touching by their points only, and every leaf glazed with a flake of rock-crystal, was no doubt part of the mounting of another such. In the same tomb, that of the five corpses, was a splendidly executed head of a golden dragon with open jaws, No. 452, which appears to be the handle of this quatrefoiled stem; for the scales of the monster are similarly glazed

<sup>1</sup> *χρυσήν, εὐστέφανος*, *Il.* iii. 64; *Od.* iv. 14 *et al.*; viii. 288. In the shorter hymn to the goddess the force of both epithets seems combined in *χρυσόστέφανος*, *Hym. Hom.* vi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* ix. 38, 99, 156.

<sup>3</sup> *i.* 15.

<sup>4</sup> *ii.* 268.

<sup>5</sup> *Il.* i. 245.

<sup>6</sup> *Od.* xi. 91, 569.

<sup>7</sup> *ἄφθονον αἰεὶ*.—*Il.* ii. 46.

<sup>8</sup> *Il.* 101-7; see *Pausan.* ix. xl. 11, 12, for a sceptre hallowed with divine honours, as traditionally believed to be this of Agamemnon, at Chæronea in Bœotia.

with crystal flakes, of which one only had fallen off. This is perhaps the strongest presumption which the remains offer in favour of the claim of the tomb to be that of the King of Men himself. Some remarkable sceptre—as we may presume it to have been from the careful record—was, according to the poet, a traditional heirloom of the Mycenæan dynasty. The tomb presents us with one which would have been remarkable if found anywhere at any time. The poet bestows on it no descriptive touches, save that the Fire-god wrought it, but in the royal accoutrements he places the dragon as the dominant emblem. Dragon-forms crowd the king's corslet, and are repeated in his shield-belt.<sup>1</sup> But this remarkable sceptre becomes little short of marvellous when, after three millenniums probably of entombment 'full fathom five' below the soil of which it symbolised the sway, it starts from its repose, having moulted just one crystal flake in the long period, and reveals precisely the device royal of the Agamemnonian panoply. But on the other hand, of course, our critics will remind us that any king may be buried with his sceptre at his side, that a 'dragon' is only a serpent, that the Argolid was rather rife with serpents, being a dry or thirsty region,<sup>2</sup> that one became the symbol, later, of the Epidaurian Æsculapius, that any king of the dynasty, or region, might easily assume it, and that after all the 'dragon' may turn out to be a fish.

We pass on then to the Homeric belt for shield or sword. As regards the former, no defensive armour was found in any of the tombs. There was an abundance of swords, knives, and arrow-heads, not a few of the latter obsidian; but fire or decay had been fatal to their shafts, as also to the bows probably deposited with them. The 'knife hung close to the sheath of his great sword' on Agamemnon's person;<sup>3</sup> and the bifurcate sword-belt, (*Mycenæ*, No. 369) may have sustained both weapons. But we find a delineation of the shield and its strap on a vase-fragment. It is broad and traverses the chest. The shield-strap of Agamemnon and that of Achilles were of silver,<sup>4</sup> the former having, as aforesaid, a three-headed dragon of bronze (as we take the doubtful *κύανος* to be) coiling along it. The marvellous belt of Herakles, before referred to, is of gold, and will therefore bear comparison with many Mycenæan specimens. The figures upon it, as detailed above, may to a large extent be paralleled, although not from the belts discovered, yet from many other samples of figured

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xi. 26-8, 38-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* iii. 272.

<sup>3</sup> *πολυδίψιον* Ἀργος, *Il.* iv. 171.

<sup>4</sup> xi. 39-41; xviii. 480.

metal surface in different objects, which include the lion in various attitudes of repose or combat with man or bull, and a duel of warriors with a mortal wound.

Further, from this belt of Herakles we may interpret the embroidered girdle of Aphrodite, the figures on which are described by abstract terms, 'love, desire, caressing blandishment,'<sup>1</sup> but which are doubtless to be understood of concrete forms suggesting those feelings. In the tomb of five were found three shoulder-belts of gold, one of which, No. 354, measured 4 ft. 1½ in. long by 1¾ in. broad, ornamented with six-leaved rosettes, and with apertures, like keyholes, at one end, as though for some clasp to attach by. No. 369, referred to above, is a suspender, curiously like the termination of a pair of braces in the modern world, as the main strap, which is of a very long oval form and has a long volute ornament of elegant design, parts off at its lower end into two narrower thongs, while its upper end terminates in a ring, probably to run on some other belt across the chest, and the bifurcate lower extremities might sustain a sword, or, as suggested, sword and knife. In fact, we probably have such a belt as Homer calls a 'suspender' (*ἀορτήρ*), a term applied to the aforesaid one of Herakles. By such golden slings the sword of Agamemnon was sustained.<sup>2</sup> Round the loins of the chief corpse in the tomb of five was a golden baldric firmly attached to a two-edged sword, and where the belt met the scabbard was a golden disc. On the arm-bone was a broad gold ribbon and floral ornament of *repoussée* work, No. 459, while above the knee was a golden band to attach the greave, besides a golden ornament for the greave, No. 338, which may be perhaps the Homeric *ἐπισφύριον*. But the greave itself, such a prominent piece of the heroic panoply, had perished. It probably, therefore, was not metallic. Homer's greaves are in some remarkable instances of tin.

The sword of the Homeric hero—at least one form of it—is a weapon of considerable length (*ἀορ τανύηκης*),<sup>3</sup> and such is one type—the prevailing one, it should seem—of the Mycenaean, the larger specimens of which, when entire, were probably over three feet long. Another form found at Mycenæ, No. 446, and also represented as slung on the chariot rudely carved on the tombstone, No. 140, is a broad two-edged blade, tapering towards the point; and, as most of the sword-blows in the *Iliad* are given with edge, not point, this type also may have its illustrative value.<sup>4</sup> The Homeric

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xiv. 216-7.<sup>2</sup> *Il.* xi. 31.<sup>3</sup> *Il.* xiv. 385 *et al.*<sup>4</sup> Cf. *φάσγανον ἀμφηκες*.—*Il.* x. 256.

weapon has the epithet *κωπήεις*,<sup>1</sup> denoting probably massiveness or prominence of hilt, but appears to have no guard. Where we have all details of equipment so fully given, the negative evidence of no guard being mentioned is strong. A sword breaks in combat (*ἀμφὶ καυλόν*) 'round the stem' or 'shaft,'<sup>2</sup> which expression reminds us of that used for a broken spear,<sup>3</sup> and seems an unlikely one, if there had been any guard in the way. Probably, therefore, spear and sword were so far alike. Similarly the Mycenæan swords appear to have no guards. But it is as regards the mounting and equipment that the Homeric weapon receives most illustrations. Of the sword-belt we have already spoken. Twenty of the larger swords in the tomb of five had handles inlaid with gold, and large golden nails were conspicuous in the *débris* of their mountings. Again we illustrate the weapon of Agamemnon, which had blazing golden nails, a silver scabbard, and golden sling-straps.<sup>4</sup> The hilts of two near one body at the north end were richly crusted with gold, No. 460. We have no golden hilt precisely so styled in Homer, who seems to love metallic contrasts, and makes the hilt, where costly, of silver,<sup>5</sup> the nails or studs of gold. Apollo, however, is gifted with a 'golden sword,'<sup>6</sup> which may probably mean golden-mounted in respect of hilt, etc. The Mycenæan scabbards had perished, being probably wooden, but must once have been hidden with gold plates and discs. An ivory handle, supposed to be that of a dagger, spiralled or marked with concentric circles, is mentioned as found. Another such weapon was found entire, with its handle inlaid with bone or wood. Both illustrate the weapon presented to Odysseus at Alcinoüs' court, in which ivory and circular ornamentation are expressly mentioned.<sup>7</sup> Again we read of fifteen swords with great golden hilts, further illustrating the epithet *κωπήεις* mentioned above.

The large shield is called by Homer *ἄσπις ἀμφιβρότη*,<sup>8</sup> as enveloping the man. A massive jewel, No. 254, once a member of a lady's necklace, from Mycenæ, shows for its device a single combat in which one warrior receives a mortal wound over the upper edge of a large shield. The shield is either moulded in two compartments, or partly cloven—at any rate, deeply indented—through about half its diameter, by a previous heavy blow. The wearer's chin nearly touches its

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xv. 713.<sup>2</sup> xvi. 338.<sup>3</sup> *ἐν καυλῷ ἑάγη*.—*Il.* xiii. 162 *et al.*; cf. xvi. 115.<sup>4</sup> xi. 29-31.<sup>5</sup> *Il.* i. 219; *Od.* viii. 403-4.<sup>6</sup> *Il.* v. 509; xv. 256.<sup>7</sup> *δῶσω δὲ οἱ ἄορ παγγάλκεον, φ' ἐπὶ κώπη ἀργυρῇ, κόδιον δὲ νεοπρίστον ἐλέφαντος ἀμφιβεδιῆται*.—*Od.* viii. 403-5.<sup>8</sup> *Il.* ii. 389 *et al.*

upper edge, its lower has reached the ground, as he falls forward on the point of the other's weapon, and it envelops the whole man, so that only the head and right arm fully, and one leg partially, are visible. Again, a vase, No. 80, shows several warriors, each with a large oval shield, held with the shorter diameter vertical, yet even so covering the man from chin to knee. In this attitude the shield would be more portable, when on the arm; but if slung from the shoulder with the longer diameter vertical, we can easily realise the description of Hector's shield jolting against neck and ankle as he marched.<sup>1</sup> In one battle scene a warrior trips up over his own shield and falls.<sup>2</sup> This may possibly be intended in the case of the falling warrior in the duel described above. Our last illustration of the Homeric large shield is of another pattern, corresponding with the description of the shield of Ajax, 'like a tower.'<sup>3</sup> It is from the intaglio of a gold signet, No. 335, found in the tomb of five. One warrior there vanquishes three, one of whom has a long shield half or more than half cylindrical laterally. And in a vase, No. 213, we have a shield, circular, less a segment or lentil-shaped piece, cut off at bottom, and reaching thus only from neck to hips, perhaps illustrating the Homeric lighter shield (*λαισίχιον*).<sup>4</sup>

This same No. 213, our last illustration of the shield, yields our first illustration of the helmet, which there appears light and small as regards protection afforded, but exuberant as regards display of crest; although this latter is only partly shown, as the border of the vase form intercepts it. Every student of the *Iliad* will remember the large number of fatal wounds given in the head, face, and adjacent parts.<sup>5</sup> Here, correspondingly, all the features, chin, throat, and ears, appear undefended. The cap of the helmet seems to sit loosely on the head, and has no chin-strap such as Homer ascribes to it in one passage.<sup>6</sup> The crown is surmounted by a large protuberant knob, which may perhaps be intended to break the shock of a weapon from above, and would easily offer to a foe such a handle as Menelaüs perhaps found in it in his combat with Paris.<sup>7</sup> The crest, however, shown only in part here, is clearly of the same fashion as one worn in the

<sup>1</sup> vi. 117.<sup>2</sup> xv. 645-7.<sup>3</sup> *σάκος ἥτε πύργον*.—*Il.* xi. 485; xvii. 128. The *σάκος* and the *ἄσπις* are probably of different forms; the latter circular, or nearly so. But the poet does not always keep them distinct.<sup>4</sup> *Il.* v. 453; xii. 426.<sup>5</sup> So *Il.* xvi. 338-9: *ἵπ' σβατος αὐχένα θείνεν . . . πᾶν δ' εἴσω ἔδν ξίφος*; and xiii. 614-5: *κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν ἵπποδασείης ἄκρον ὑπὸ λόφον αἰτόν*.<sup>6</sup> *Il.* iii. 371-5.<sup>7</sup> *Il.* iii. 369-70.

duel before referred to. In this latter the knob is raised above the crown on a small stem, while the crest projects like a curved horn springing out from the forehead, and arches itself highly backward, too highly indeed for the horse-hair tuft which waves from it to reach the occiput. But there is no reason for thinking that Homeric helmets were all of one type,<sup>1</sup> through assuming which apparently Buttmann and others have failed in some of their interpretations. Some were cheek-plated (*χαλκοπάρηαι*),<sup>2</sup> and on an early Greek vase in the British Museum is a helmet form with large lateral plates covering cheek and jaw. Again, Homer gives us what has been interpreted as a helmet with a pierced visor, or something analogous to it (*αὐλῶπις τρυφάλεια*).<sup>3</sup> A Mycenaean vase, No. 37, shows a helmet covering the whole face to below the chin, and having a lozenge-shaped hole cut at the eye, defended by two small cross-bars. To pass on to the crest (*λόφος*), Homer speaks as if 'nodding' was its peculiar attribute.<sup>4</sup> Alcæus describes it as 'nodding' still when hung on its peg in the armoury.<sup>5</sup> A glance at the Mycenaean vase design, No. 213, with the tube, no doubt metallic, projecting from the forehead, shows us that this might easily be so. A slight degree of elasticity in the metal would make this slender socket vibrate with every breath; and we realise the line, 'The horsehaired helms with dazzling crests were touching as they nodded,'<sup>6</sup> when marching in dense array, since the crest of the man before would easily sweep the front of the helmet behind. A helmet-crest found at Hissarlik (*Troy and its Remains*, p. 280, fig. No. 191) is of two pieces, upper and lower, with a channel grooved along the ridge of the upper piece to receive the hair, not unlike the fashion, which corresponds more with conventional notions, shown in the figure of Pallas on the Burgon vase in the British Museum,<sup>7</sup> where the two sections or layers of the crest-stock are plainly distinguished. Still, there are probably other Homeric types of helmet which yet await illustration. We can, however, illustrate the caps worn by Diomedes and Odysseus in their night foray on the Trojan camp, which had no ornament or protective pieces save the boars' teeth which garnished one of them, and was of

<sup>1</sup> The variety of names, *κυνή, κόρυς, πῆληξ*, seems to show this, as *εἶφος, ἄορ. φάσγανον* for sword; but, as in the case of the shield, they are not always kept distinct.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* xii. 183 *et al.*

<sup>3</sup> xiii. 530 *et al.*

<sup>4</sup> *Il.* iii. 337 *et al.*

<sup>5</sup> *Fragm.* 15 (Bergk), 2, 3.

<sup>6</sup> *ψαῖον δ' ἵπποκομοὶ κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισι, νεύοντων.*—*Il.* xiii. 132; xvi. 216.

<sup>7</sup> It is figured in *Odyssey*, ed. Hayman, vol. i. p. xl., App. C.



bull's or some other hide.<sup>1</sup> The same vase, No. 213, shows a head in a cap, not unlike in shape to our own 'Glengarry,' of hide, retaining the hair, which bristles up stiffly all over it. As to the boar's-teeth embellishment, we notice the fact that a number of such teeth were found in the tomb of five, pierced with holes as if to attach them, besides a larger number of square ornamental plates cut from such teeth.

The Homeric spear admits of but little illustration. The spear-head had a tubular socket to receive the shaft,<sup>2</sup> and had a ring fixed somewhere below the head to keep the shaft from splitting.<sup>3</sup> This latter would probably be on the wood, and might disappear with it. None such, at any rate, has been found; but the spear-heads at Mycenæ had in several instances a ring or rings attached to the metal in order to prevent by means of a cord the loss of the head, and all the specimens are tubular. Specimens of the double<sup>4</sup> and single headed axe, exactly as distinguished in the archery prize at Patroclus' funeral, were found,<sup>5</sup> but not as there of iron or perhaps steel.<sup>6</sup> In the *Odyssey* the axes have a ring attached to one extremity, and Odysseus shoots through these rings. No Mycenæan axe is thus ringed, but many swords were found with a ring at the end of the handle.

The Homeric chariot has, we believe, been previously illustrated in all its parts except one, the *πελρις*, an appendage to a travelling chariot,<sup>7</sup> or which might be specially attached to an ordinary one.<sup>8</sup> The chariot carved on the tombstone, No. 141, from the Mycenæan Acropolis, has some such appendage behind the plinth of the chariot on which the rider stands. The imperfect delineation prevents any certain judgment, but from the rounded lines and shallow configuration it seems contrasted, as regards material and make, with the more angular and rigid-looking plinth itself; and it may possibly represent basket-work such as one scholiastic tradition assigns to the *πελρις*. In *Cyprus*, pp. 268, 427, are figured two chariots from vases, each with a double body and a rider in each compartment. In the former the compartments seem

<sup>1</sup> κυνέην . . . ταυρείην, ἀφαλὸν τε καὶ ἄλλοφον, ἥ τε κατὰ τύχην κέκληται.—*II.* x. 257-9. κυνέην . . . ῥινόυ ποιητήν, πολέσιν δ' ἐντοσθεν ἱμάσιν ἐντέτατο στερεῶς· ἐκτοσθε δὲ λευκοὶ ὀδόντες ἀργυροδοντος ὕδς θαμέες ἔχον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.—*Ibid.* 261-4.

<sup>2</sup> *II.* xvii. 297.

<sup>3</sup> viii. 495.

<sup>4</sup> xxiii. 851.

<sup>5</sup> *Mycenæ*, p. 111. A four-bladed axe is also figured in the remarkable very early signet, where it stands as if symbolically above the centre of the group of figures, p. 354, 4.

<sup>6</sup> ἰώεντα σίδηρον.—*Ib.* 850.

<sup>7</sup> *Od.* xv. 131.

<sup>8</sup> *II.* xxiv. 190.

precisely similar; in the latter the hinder part is slightly shallower in form and rounder in outline than that in front.

An *cœnochoë* from Curium, a Greek city of Cyprus, shows a grotesquely misshapen man and horse. The former appears to be leaping on the latter's back, and has his arms expanded as if to balance himself in the leap, while his right leg—the nearer one—appears thrown up some height above the level of the horse's back. In spite of the uncouth drawing, it seems impossible to mistake the attitude, which is that of the horse-acrobat, to whom Ajax is compared as he leaps from ship to ship to defend the Greek fleet from Hector.<sup>1</sup> Another horse is just in front of him (*Cyprus*, p. 333). In concluding this part of the subject, we may notice that Homer gives to the chariot reins the epithet *σνγαλόεντα*, 'glossy' or 'burnished.'<sup>2</sup> Perhaps this merely contrasts the reins with some other parts of the harness, which might be of rough leather or of undressed hide. But it seems more likely that ornamentation with some polished substance is intended; as the same epithet is applied to the head-gear (*δέσματα*) of Andromachê,<sup>3</sup> to the polish of a chair of distinction,<sup>4</sup> and to the personal apartment of Penelopê, probably from burnished woodwork or furniture.<sup>5</sup> Garments also and rugs (*ρήγες*),<sup>6</sup> such as are often used for bedding, are described by the same epithet. Dr. Schliemann (*Mycenæ*, p. 153) notices 'some objects of ivory, bone, or metallic composition,' which he thought may have served to ornament horse-trappings. The epithet seems more easily justified in this than in any other way. Indeed, Homer expressly once mentions 'reins white with ivory.'<sup>7</sup> 'Many small pieces of bone,' supposed ornaments of horse trappings, were found in the tomb of five, illustrating also the ivory (in Homer dyed crimson) cheek-plate (*παρήμῳ*) of a horse.'

We next come to personal ornamentation. Each of the golden diadems referred to in the tomb of three had a pin and tube for fixing round the head. We read of the cloak of Odysseus as having 'a golden clasp fashioned with a pair of tubes.'<sup>8</sup> The ornamentation of the clasp was a hunting group of hound and fawn, the lively attitudes and eager expression of which are dwelt upon.<sup>9</sup> Dr. Schliemann describes a gold plate, which seems to have decorated a scab-

<sup>1</sup> *κεληρίζειν εὖ εἰδώς*.—*Il.* xv. 679 foll.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* xxii. 468.

<sup>4</sup> *Od.* v. 86.

<sup>3</sup> *Il.* v. 226 *et al.*

<sup>5</sup> *Od.* xvi. 449 *et al.*

<sup>6</sup> *Od.* vi. 38 *et al.*

<sup>7</sup> *Il.* v. 582.

<sup>8</sup> *περόνη χρυσοῖο τέτυκτο αἰλοῖσιν διδύμοισιν*.—*Od.* xix. 226-7.

<sup>9</sup> *Ib.* 230-1.

bard, bearing the device of a lion in pursuit of a stag, which, feeling itself lost, turns round and looks at its pursuer 'with a face full of anguish.' And there is certainly in this and other animal groups from Mycenæ enough to show that the expressiveness of brute attitude and look had been studied with some success by the artist, as we see from the poem they were appreciated by his patrons. Thus both the mechanism and decoration of the Odyssean brooch receive close illustration from the remains. The dress of the goddess Hera is fastened with 'golden pins.'<sup>1</sup> Three gold pins among many small ornaments, supposed of a child's size, were found in the tomb of five, one, No. 362, remarkably headed with the figure of a small ram, which again illustrates the fondness for animal decoration. In the women's tomb were ten golden grass-hoppers with chains, illustrating closely the personal habit ascribed by Thucyclides to the elderly gentlemen of his own recollection at Athens.<sup>2</sup> In the same tomb were an enormous quantity of amber beads for necklaces, besides several of gold, and three perforated massive golden ornaments for the same purpose. In the supposed most ancient tomb of all outside the Mycenæan agora were fourteen golden necklace beads. These latter may illustrate the legend of Eriphylê, which in its most widely current form speaks of her as bribed by a necklace. Homer merely says that she received 'gold of high price';<sup>3</sup> this jewellery shows that gold alone was so used. Thus the necklace of green stones shown at Amathus to Pausanias as that of Eriphylê,<sup>4</sup> followed of course the later change of fashion in favour of stones. Amber, however, was in early times a favourite substance for such gear, as we find from the ornament brought by the Phœnician trader in *Od.* xv. 460,<sup>5</sup> and the one presented to Penelopê in *Od.* xviii. 295-6.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, in this Mycenæan tomb we

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xiv. 180, χρυσεῖς ἐνετῆσι, which should mean things 'inserted' or 'stuck in' for the purpose, as contrasted with the brooch, which is treated as if belonging to the garment permanently. As regards the 'twelve golden clasps' (πέροναι) of the πέπλος presented by Antinoüs to Penelopê in *Od.* xviii. 293-4, said to be κλήσις ἐγγράμπτους ἀραρνίαι, we have looked in vain for anything equally near to illustrate them. Their number, indeed, is the same as that of certain large lozenge-shaped buttons, which may have been probably used for a similar purpose, on a man's dress, however, and with a mechanism totally different. They are figured as No. 378, from the tomb of five.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. i. 6: καὶ χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐνέρσει κρόβυλον ἀναδούμενοι τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν.

<sup>3</sup> ἡ χρυσὸν φίλου ἀνδρὸς ἐδέξατο τιμήντα.—*Od.* xi. 327.

<sup>4</sup> Pausan. ix. xli. 2. <sup>5</sup> χρύσειον ὄρμον ἔχων, μετὰ δ' ἡλέκτροισιν ἔρτο.

<sup>6</sup> ὄρμον χρύσειον, ἡλέκτροισιν ἐρμένον.

seem to see an assortment of such 'trinkets' as were used by the crafty merchantmen to beguile the fancy of the Greek women.<sup>1</sup> Again, we have, No. 265, a beautiful brooch of two stags joined together on fronds of palm, the stem of which is a silver pin. The animals are well rendered, even to the dappling of their coats. Another such consists of a pair of lion's cubs on a date-palm. But the most curious brooch of all, No. 292, is fashioned into a golden lady, we may suppose in full dress, having a necklace and all appurtenances, and out of whose head rises a large and graceful ornament which may be either a feather-fan or a palm-tree. Then, too, were a vast number of mere golden medallion ornaments with various fancy devices, all of animals, among them twenty-seven cuttle-fish, the long graceful curves of whose feelers made him a favourite with the artist. Here again we have a simile of Homer reflected, who notes the creature with the 'little-cups' (*κοτυληδόνας*)<sup>2</sup> which arm his feelers, and even Homeric narrative; for what else is Scylla than a compound of this monster with something like shark-heads at her extremities? Her *habitat* and her mode of fishing for her prey alike tally. And again we have here the 'golden Aphroditè' in a small female figure in that metal with her favourite doves perching upon her, Nos. 267, 268. In the class of figures to which this belongs, the 'golden damsels' of Hephæstus,<sup>3</sup> may perhaps find their prototype.

The lady's head-gear of golden trinketry found at Hisarlik (*Troy*, p. 335) is now too well known through our weekly illustrated contemporaries to need description. It is probably the 'twisted chain-work wreath' (*πλεκτὴ ἀναδέσμη*) of Andromachê, and the golden encircling fillet, whence the golden filaments depend, may probably be traced in the same passage as the *ἄμπυξ*.<sup>4</sup> The 'golden and silver dogs,' the

<sup>1</sup> *Od.* xv. 415-6: Φοίνικες ναυσίκλυτοι ἦλυνθον ἄνδρες τρώεται, μυρὶ ἄγοντες ἀθύρματα νηὶ μελαίνῃ.

<sup>2</sup> *Od.* v. 432-3; see, for the description of Scylla, xii. 89-97.

<sup>3</sup> *Il.* xviii. 417-418.

<sup>4</sup> *Il.* xxii. 469-70. Besides these she wears the (*κρήδεμνα*) turban with lappets, and the puzzling *κεκρύφαλον*. Assuming the etymology of the latter word to involve *κρύπτω*, it might stand for the mask or visor figured on the very ancient signet (*Mycenæ*, No. 530, p. 354) as worn by women. Such an appendage, to save the face from sunburning, is said to be worn by the women of Cnidos, one of the Cyclades; see Mr. Gladstone's preface to Dr. Schliemann's *Mycenæ*, near the end. For the *κρήδεμνα* see Di Cesnola's *Cyprus*, p. 285, where a head of a veiled female occurs, showing long lappets depending, which, on occasion, might be drawn right and left over the face, illustrating the use made by Penelopè of hers: ἄντα παρειῶν σχομένη λισπὰ κρήδεμνα.—*Od.* i. 334 *et al.*

work of Hephæstus, described among the marvels of the Phæacian palace,<sup>1</sup> were probably founded on such works as in No. 532, a massive golden lion recumbent, cast and tooled, which, Mr. Stuart Poole thinks, has an Egyptian look.<sup>2</sup>

But of all the ornamentation at Mycenæ the gold button or disc is the most ubiquitous and characteristic. Its type is a wooden core enwrapped with gold plate, and ornamented with some pattern in *repoussée*. The size varies from that of a large watch-case to that of a sixpence. The number of these was overwhelming, they were bestowed with equal profusion on males and females, on the warrior's scabbard and on the lady's tunic. Here and there a tripod or vase was full of them, and where the tomb had been disturbed before, although the larger ones had been removed, there were a number of the smaller ones sticking in the soil. On each of the buried ladies, like an *inclusam Danaën*, the golden shower seems to have fallen heavy in death. The first thought that occurs to one is: Were they a kind of currency? The notion of an 'image and superscription' as being needful for that purpose is of course of far too late origin for the pre-historic world with which we are dealing. Cæsar's *Galli* used iron rings of a standard weight for money.<sup>3</sup> Cowrie shells and other substitutes obtain in different parts of the modern world. Without, however, more than suggesting this question, let us consider their form. It must have had some meaning. May it not represent the 'mushroom' (*μύκης*) of the Mycenæan legend given by Pausanias?<sup>4</sup> That legend connects the *μύκης* with the hero-founder's scabbard, and the most conspicuous use to which we find the ornament put in the extant remains is to adorn the weapon-sheath.<sup>5</sup> As far as we know as yet, they are unique, and only found in the city to which the name suggested belongs. Together, this amounts to a presumption in favour of this notion. But the only real answer to such questions is 'Wait and see.' We cannot yet have seen the last of these mines of pre-historic antiquities. Our solid knowledge of that old world will ripen the faster, if we abstain from rash theories until the tale is complete.

<sup>1</sup> *Od.* vii. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1878.

<sup>3</sup> *Cæsar de Bello Gallico*, v. 12. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Pausan. II. xvi. 3: τοῦ ξίφους γὰρ ἔνταυθα ἐξέπεσεν ὁ μύκης αὐτῷ (Περσεί) καὶ τὸ σημεῖον ἐς οἰκισμὸν ἐνόμιζε συμβῆναι πόλεως. He gives also another version of the application of the name, *ibid.* But this suffices for our purpose.

<sup>5</sup> Of course, when once established, they would rapidly become conventional as regards pattern; and desire of novelty in design would easily efface all tokens of connexion with their legendary origin.

There remain to be noticed the cups, and the tripods, caldrons, and other such utensils. The obvious resemblance of these to the Homeric type and standard caught the eye of the educated public at once, and the case is too complete for us to find space here for more than a few leading examples. We will take the famous cup of Nestor. It was of unusual size, and had four 'ears,' *i.e.* projecting handles, and each handle was between a pair of doves, who seemed dipping their beaks into the contents. It had also two bases or supports to steady it below. It was fastened together with golden nails.<sup>1</sup> Of the general material, nothing is said. It was probably of silver wholly or parcel gilt.

In *Mycenæ*, No. 346, we have a cup with a single pair of handles so projecting, and one dove on each with beak depressed as in the act of sipping.<sup>2</sup> This, then, contains the rudiment of the Nestorian tankard; we have only to multiply handles and doves. For the bases (*πυθμένες*) of the latter we must look elsewhere, *viz.* to Hissarlik. There (*Troy and its Remains*, Nos. 239, 240) was found a boat-shaped cup, which shows what seems to be an oval ridge, forming a socket-foot to steady it. It shows, in fact, probably what Homer calls the *πυθμῆν* of a cup. This of course might be of any form convenient for the make of the cup. It seems likely that in Nestor's tankard the handles, as in *Mycenæ*, No. 346, ran down to the foot, and that where they met the foot were the *πυθμένες*. We may notice by the way that the Hissarlik specimen gives a real form of the *ἀμφικύπελλον*, being a cup with a lip for pouring each way, large and small. Of course, there may have been other forms. But the last point of illustration for the Nestorian tankard is that of its nails. Dr. Schliemann expressly informs us that no soldering was found in any Mycenæan tomb, but that all the metallic vessels were joined *with numerous pins*. Indeed, in No. 346 the holes through which the nails have passed are plainly visible in the strap-handle torn loose from its attachment to the bowl. In the tomb of three was found (No. 482) a fragment of a large silver vase, the lips of which were of copper thickly plated with gold, and again in the tomb of five a large silver gold-plated goblet. This closely resembles

<sup>1</sup> The Greek is οὕτως δ' αὐτοῦ τέσσαρ' ἔσαν, δοιαί δὲ πελειάδες ἀμφὶ ἑκαστον χρύσειαι νεμέθοντο, δύο δ' ὑπὸ πυθμένες ἦσαν, *Il.* xi. 633-5.

<sup>2</sup> The cup stands on a single flat foot, out of which its stem rises to sustain the bowl, while from the handles broad straps run down to the foot, curving inwards, and having attachment to the bowl near its bottom.



the description of a cup offered by Menelaüs to Telemachus, 'of massy silver, finished at the lips with gold.'<sup>1</sup> The epithet *ἀνθεμόεντα*, which we take to be 'flower-patterned,' applied by Homer to a caldron,<sup>2</sup> is found illustrated on a Mycenaean cup, No. 344, which has a row of cinquefoil ornaments.

The tripods and caldrons at Mycenæ may be classed together with other domestic vessels, all of copper, whereas all the metallic weapons are of bronze. At Hissarlik, however, were found a lance-head and battle-axes of pure copper (*Troy, &c.*, Nos. 252-60). *Mycenæ*, No. 440, is about 1 foot in diameter, with three handles, but shallow, and having a small lip to pour. From its description it might easily have served for a basin for ablutions. This is about a medium size. Many are of much less diameter, and the largest reach a diameter of 2 feet, and even 2½ feet. The largest size mentioned in Homer is a prize one 'of two-and-twenty measures,' and the same passage mentions another 'of four measures.'<sup>3</sup> The Mycenaean remains on the whole rather surpass the standard of Homeric description in the same kind than fall short of it; and probably the largest of the Mycenaean vessels may be roughly equated with this largest Homeric one, while the handles, especially those of one larger specimen which are vertical, illustrate the epithet *ὠτῶεντα*,<sup>4</sup> 'having ears,' an expression familiar to us from the well-known proverb about 'little pitchers.' The distinction drawn by the poet between vessels which had and which had not been on the fire, is preserved among the Mycenaean remains.<sup>5</sup> In the tomb of five were found five large copper caldrons, having a diameter of from 14 inches to 20 inches, of which three showed marks of use on the fire. The Fire-god in Homer has a 'silver (perhaps meaning silver-mounted) chest' or box to receive his tools.<sup>6</sup> In the women's tomb at Mycenæ was a golden box, with the lid fastened on by wire, and several boxes of copper-plate, which latter had been filled with wood (p. 208-9).

The material of ivory is somewhat fully introduced into the Homeric Poems, but appears very sparingly in proportion at Mycenæ, of which more anon. The chair of Penelopë is spiralled (*δινωτή*) with ivory and silver,<sup>7</sup> i.e. with plates of them

<sup>1</sup> ἀργύρεος δὲ ἔστιν ἄπας, χρυσῷ δ' ἐπὶ χεῖλεα κεκράανται.—*Od.* iv. 615-6 et al.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* xxiii. 885.

<sup>3</sup> *Il.* xviii. 413.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 264-8. In *Fragm. Hom.* 86 is found mention of a *τρίποδα χρυσοῦσαν*, but this decoration does not seem to be illustrated by any known remains.

<sup>5</sup> *Il.* xxiii. 267-8, ἄπυρον κατέθηκε λέβητα, καλὸν . . . λευκὸν ἔτ' αὐτῶς, and 270, ἀμφίθετον φυάλην ἀπύρωτον ἔθηκεν, and 885, λέβητ' ἄπυρον.

<sup>6</sup> *Il.* xviii. 413.

<sup>7</sup> *Od.* xix. 55-6.

showing spiral patterns. The bedstead of Odysseus was enriched or variegated (*δαιδάλλων*) with gold, silver, and ivory;<sup>1</sup> and ivory, with amber and the metals, appears in the decoration of Menelaüs' palace interior,<sup>2</sup> with which compare the 'ivory gate' of dreamland.<sup>3</sup> We have already noticed the sword with ivory scabbard, said, as well as the chair, to be spirally ornamented (*ἀμφιδεδίηται*). There remains the ivory handle of Penelopë's treasure-key, the rest of which was of copper.<sup>4</sup> Compare with this last the key found by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik (*Troy*, p. 333), described as 'a copper key, 4 inches long, the head of which, about 2 inches long and broad, greatly resembles the safe-key of a bank. Curiously enough, this key has had a wooden handle. There can be no doubt of this from the fact that the end of the stalk of the key is bent round at a right angle as in the case of the daggers.' He does not state his grounds for believing wood the material, but even if the material was wood the illustration is close and pertinent.

Besides the ivory plates, supposed by Dr. Schliemann, as before referred to, to be horse-trappings, and the dagger handle also mentioned above, we have only noticed a small beehive-shaped piece of ivory marked with a cross, from the tomb of three, an ivory needle, No. 229, and about a dozen other small pieces of various forms, Nos. 224-5, as found at Mycenæ. For the combination of ivory with metals we have an analogue in the golden comb with teeth of bone found in the women's tomb. In this we trace the faint beginnings of chryselephantine decoration and sculptured portraiture, the favourite material afterwards of the greatest artists of the world in their palmyest period. The ivory rein-ornaments of *Iliad* v. have been already mentioned and illustrated. Of ivory crimson-dyed, introduced in a simile,<sup>5</sup> the remains furnish no example. The prevalence at Mycenæ of spiral and circular ornamentation is a feature which lies on the surface. In every or almost every material found it maintains its dominant character. The express mention of any definite type of mechanical ornament is comparatively rare in Homer,<sup>6</sup> but where any is mentioned

<sup>1</sup> xxiii. 199-200.<sup>2</sup> *Od.* iv. 73.<sup>3</sup> xix. 563.<sup>4</sup> xxi. 7.<sup>5</sup> *Il.* iv. 141-2.<sup>6</sup> We have mostly general words, *δαιδάλλων*, *τένυκτο*, and the like; the former often or mostly referring to a surface enriched with a contrast of several materials, as the shield of Achilles, the latter to rich workmanship generally.

it is mostly of the circular or spiral type.<sup>1</sup> Again, the dominant material of artistic work in Homer is unquestionably metal. The many fashions of cup, tripod, armour, and palace-interior, all attest this. Especially the use of gold and silver belts and girdles,<sup>2</sup> where another material would be suggested by convenience, is even more decisive proof. And this is exactly what we find at Mycenæ. Of course it may be said, as against this, that metal survives when many other materials perish. But stone, marble, lapidary gems, ivory, even bone, does not perish, while well-baked pottery defies time even in its tints, to say nothing of its form. But the percentage of all these materials put together, except the pottery, as against the metallic remains at Mycenæ, is somewhat as Sir John Falstaff's allowance of bread to his sack, and the pottery is contemptibly poor; that from the tombs, which were each almost a gold mine, being either hand-made or very ancient wheel-made. Again, at Mycenæ, if we except weapons and domestic utensils, gold, at any rate for the purposes of art, seems to supersede and almost drive out all other not only metals but materials.<sup>3</sup> As for silver, it rarely appears. No. 478 is a large silver vase, 2 ft. 6 in. deep by 1 ft. 8 in. diameter, enriched with *repoussée* work and interwoven spirals. Several silver goblets of curious work and large size were found in the tomb of five. Two vases of silver, one with twelve golden stars, and two broken silver goblets also appear, p. 210. In the supposed oldest tomb outside the agora, as against four golden double-handled cups, several gold rings, gold wire in coils, and a gold signet with an intaglio of mysterious interest, was found a single silver ring. In the tomb of three was a fragment of a silver vase before referred to, but its mouth was of copper thickly plated with gold. In another tomb was found the golden mouthpiece and handle of a silver vase, and some of the gold brooches had silver pins. Two silver mountings of sceptres, gold-plated, appear in Nos. 309-10. We believe that this is all or nearly all the silver—a mere sprinkling—which the Mycenæan tombs disclosed.

The great paucity of ivory is another remarkable feature. We have seen how fully ivory enters into Homeric decorative

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* xiii. 407, of a shield; iii. 391, of a bedstead; *Od.* viii. 405, of a scabbard; xix. 56, of a chair.

<sup>2</sup> *Od.* v. 232; x. 545. *Il.* iv. 133; xx. 415.

<sup>3</sup> We may illustrate the characteristic prevalence of gold at Mycenæ by the contrast in precisely similar articles found lately at Dodona: 'One of the richest sections of these discoveries consists of thin plates of *bronze*, *repoussée*, which were laid on as decorations to belts, sheathes, leather helmets, or cuirasses.'—*Contemporary Review*, November 1878, 848.

work, especially where, as in the case of Menelaüs and the Trojan Mydon, who drives with ivory-mounted reins, an Asiatic source may be presumed for the supply. But the Pelopid dynasty was of Asiatic extraction, and Phœnician trade may be presumed the source of Mycenæan wealth. This scanty supply of ivory is unquestionably in favour of a high antiquity. The earliest mention of ivory in the Bible is that of Solomon's ivory throne and traffic with Ophir. Indeed, more than half the passages in the Old Testament which mention ivory are either in the historical records of his reign or in his Epithalamium, Psalm xlv., or in the Song of Songs, his accredited work. It may be supposed that his oriental commerce first introduced it on a large scale, and that previously the supply was as insignificant as it is representatively at Mycenæ; and that therefore those tombs and the dynasty to which they belong date from a period at least as early as the beginning of his long reign. The absence of iron, save in a few specimens belonging to an historical period, the minute quantity of glass, the total absence of any inscription or trace of writing, plunge us in an antiquity which is higher still.

From geographical position the coasts of the Gulf of Argos would needs be the part of the Greek mainland first open to Phœnician commerce, and become the *entrepôt* for the Greek home-produce which that commerce absorbed. The ornaments show traces of maritime influence not observable elsewhere. A fine gold goblet has the image of a fish in *repoussée* upon it, very true to nature; a curious form of marine creature, sometimes called a 'sea-pen,' is figured frequently, we are told, on Mycenæan pottery; one of the smaller trinkets in the women's tomb was taken for a hippocamp or sea-horse, while the cuttlefish pattern<sup>1</sup> appears on the ornamental plates in handfuls. This points to the sea as the chief source of Mycenæan wealth, and not improbably royalty, in an Asiatic dynasty, may have carried, as in Solomon's case, the monopoly of traffic with it. Thus Mycenæ became 'rich in gold' (πολύχρυσος),<sup>2</sup> and alone of cities in Homer's song retains the title.<sup>3</sup> Thus the royal tombs might be expected to be disproportionately rich. Thus 'Agamemnon himself,' to turn to Homer, 'gave ships' to the Arcadians,<sup>4</sup> who had none; and thus his dominion included 'many

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sayce (*Contemporary Review*, December 1878, p. 75) mentions 'Ostrich eggs covered with stucco dolphins' as 'found . . . at Mykenæ.'

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* vii. 180 *et al.*

<sup>3</sup> Troy had been so once, but through the waste of war was so no more. (*Il.* xviii. 289-90.)

<sup>4</sup> *Il.* ii. 612-4.

islands as well as the whole of Argos,<sup>1</sup> with a hegemony further ranging over a wide zone of land and sea. Thus we easily account for his relations with Cyprus.<sup>2</sup> Such a dynasty and hegemony could alone have made possible a transmarine war of considerable duration. And, if the tale of Troy belong to that region of myth to which some would relegate it, what could have inspired a poet with the notion of an universal combination of Greeks for an Asiatic war? Down to the period of Macedonian supremacy there was nothing in Greek history to suggest it. The Persian invasion found Greece divided, so did Roman intervention later. The Dorian armed immigration, the formation of *nuclei* of opposite ideas at Sparta and Athens, the death-struggle of Messenia, and afterwards of Mycenæ itself, were all antagonistic to the notion of a combination of united Greece. There was everything against it; there was nothing to suggest it, if there was not a root of fact out of which it sprang.

Before we quit the region of Homeric art, some remarks seem proper on its masterpiece, the Shield of Achilles—once the stumbling-stone of critics who sought to defend the substantial antiquity of the *Iliad*, but now a strong link in the chain of proofs which evince the primitive character of the Homeric Poems. This is due to recent discoveries of the ancient world of art. The very ancient (*Mycenæ*, No. 530) signet shows one or two elements of the detail in the effigies of the sun and moon and wave-lines as if representing a stream, seen in its upper margin.<sup>3</sup> As regards the style of art indicated by the poet, the beautiful bowls of the Cypriote collection found by General di Cesnola, the great shield of Cervetri, and various specimens of early Assyrian design conspire to show that metal work with figures grouped dates as far back as any period to which our Homer can reasonably be referred, say to the ninth century B.C. A copper bowl from a tomb at Dali (Di Cesnola's *Cyprus*, p. 79) has for its subject a dance before Isis, with vases on a table before the dancers. It is said to be 'ornamented with designs peculiar to the very archaic pottery found at Idalium and elsewhere, not only in Cyprus, but on the mainland of Greece and Italy.' This, therefore, assigns to the bowl a very high antiquity. Its subject illustrates one of the many groups—the last one—introduced in the Homeric shield, and, as showing less of Phœnician and more of early Greek character than most others, it has a special interest. It ranges with Homeric art-

<sup>1</sup> *Il.* ii. 108.<sup>2</sup> xi. 20-2.<sup>3</sup> See *Il.* xviii. 484 and 607-8.

conception in representing not myth but fact, and in gathering its groups from the artist's own experience.<sup>1</sup> This is shown in early Egyptian and Assyrian art, in the recent specimens from Mycenæ, and in short all round the circle of primitive design. Mythological subjects come later, when the artist has learned to idealise and reflect. In the Homeric shield there is no myth; not even a mythical personage, save in the battle-scene where Ares and Athênê appear just as they appear on the field in the *Iliad*. And we have their attendant ministers, Strife, Uproar, and deadly Fate, blending in the *mêlle*, precisely as Terror, Fear, and Strife set the battle in array on the eve of the actual conflict between Greeks and Trojans.<sup>2</sup> Take the Hesiodic shield, and we find still, it is true, the purely human groups of mirth and peril, labour and repose, the marriage feast and the besieged city. But then there comes in the group of Perseus with the Gorgon's head and other similar impersonations which had sprung into a religious belief since Homer sang.<sup>3</sup> Take the chest of Cypselus, probably dating from some time in the seventh century B.C., and there we find the tale of Troy in Homer and the Cyclops has itself become a myth. With scenes from that tale, including the *Odyssey*, with one in particular from this very episode of the shield, Thetis bringing the divine weapons to Achilles, or with legends like that of Perseus and the Gorgon, Jason and the Argonauts, its surface is all but completely covered. The only trace of human interest is found in an historic battle-piece, which Pausanias, who describes the chest minutely, records, while criticising the local tradition as to its precise subject (Pausan. v. xviii. 2).

This shield shows traces of the influence of both the principal Homeric shields, that of Achilles and that of Agamemnon, as well as of the forms on the marvellous belt of Herakles referred to above—the last, in the zone of fierce animals which seem to intervene between the human and the mythological subjects.<sup>4</sup> Thus the Homeric shield carries a purely human

<sup>1</sup> For some part of the argument introduced here the writer is indebted to Prof. H. Brunn, *Kunst bei Homer*, p. 18 foll.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.* iv. 439–41 :

ἄρα δὲ τοὺς μὲν Ἄρης, τοὺς δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,  
Δείμος δ' ἠδὲ Φόβος καὶ Ἔρως ἄμοτον μεμνῆα,  
Ἄρεος ἀνδροφόνου κασιγνήτη ἐτάρη τε.

<sup>3</sup> The *scutum Herculis*, which we call Hesiodic in compliance with a doubtful tradition, is full of interpolations which encrust the original design; but, for the purpose of the above argument, they leave the idea of that design unclouded.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Hesiod, *Scut. Herc.* 168–77, with *Od.* xi. 610–2.



and creaturely interest. Its scenes are in turn peaceful, festive, litigious, warlike, agricultural, bucolic, choreutic. The poet has caught the artist in the infancy of art, studying in all simplicity the familiar thing before his eyes, and with beautifully unconscious consistency he makes Helen at her loom in Troy reproduce the combats waged around her. The illustration of myth has not emerged upon his mind. In the Hesiodic shield the field is largely charged with adventitious myth. On the chest it is wholly taken up by this latter, save in one last link which keeps the artist from breaking with the actual. Turn to the great historical masterpieces of later art, and myth is everywhere and man, so to speak, nowhere. Take the Phidian throne of Zeus at Olympia, and, save for the introduction of the Olympic games, which the *genius loci* required, it is a blaze of mythology from pinnacle to footstool. Take the earlier throne of Apollo at Amyclæ, and there, save for the self-interested intrusion of a portrait-panel of the artist himself and his comrades, we pass without human relief from Graces and Hours to Tritons and Dioscuri, thence to Typhœus, Echidna, and the rest of the mythic host. Take the Parthenon as Pheidias left it; it is a pantheon of Attic myth and legend from end to end. Turn next to the Euripidean shield ascribed to Achilles, and we have a description, perhaps in outline only, not in detail.<sup>1</sup> 'On it,' says the poet, 'were wrought such devices as follow: Perseus with winged sandals holding the decapitated form of the Gorgon; together with Hermes, messenger of Zeus.' The sun appears in the centre, as in Homer, but he appears 'on winged steeds.' The groups of stars, 'Pleiads and Hyads,' are also mentioned as in the *Iliad*. Here then the later poet holds on by this last link to Homer; but still with a difference, and that difference mythological, while the body of the device is mythological wholly, of which Perseus and Hermes are perhaps intended to be specimens merely. The entire human and social character of the Homeric shield is clean wiped out. On the helmet the poet places 'sphinxes,'—a monster unknown to Homer, who gives the legend of Œdipus in outline, but, significantly, with no mention of the sphinx. On the corslet he adds a 'fire-breathing lioness,' probably intending the 'Chimæra,' which is mentioned in Homer in the legend of Bellerophon as a monster destroyed by him,<sup>2</sup> but nowhere appears on accoutrements in the heroic poet. There could be no clearer testimony alike to the development of myth since Homer's

<sup>1</sup> Eurip. *Electr.* 455 foll.<sup>2</sup> *Il.* vi. 179-81; cf. xvi. 328.

day and to the extent to which it had taken possession of the artistic field. And yet we are asked to believe that 'our Homer' crept into the world and stealthily developed our present *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, somewhere about the time of Euripides! It is impossible to elicit from the internal evidence of design a more complete proof of the primitive character of the age of the designer than that which we trace in the Homeric shield.

We have shown above how Homer's love of animals, and the extent to which he takes them into partnership with humanity, point to an early stage of feeling, and how it exactly fills the gap left by his deficiency as regards that emotional play of human feature and attitude which is the surest index of mind; how the one supplements the other, and how both are accounted for—to borrow a term of modern art-history—by the 'Præ-Raffaélite' condition of contemporary art. We turn from his expression of nature to that of art, and we find the same nursery condition of the mind—the child playing at imitating the scenes that go on around it. To place the Homeric Poems, as some would do, as late as the age of Pheidias, involves an inversion of the characteristics of culture and of the laws of artistic conception; to say nothing at present of literary development, of the course of geographical and general knowledge, of the growth and progress of myth. Our space leaves us no room even to state the grounds on which that anachronism assumes to found itself, much less to pursue further its refutation.

In conclusion, all scholars owe Dr. Schliemann and his wife, who has so enthusiastically seconded him, a debt of gratitude. He has dug down to the *realien* which underlie their paper studies. He has devoted a life's energy and a life's fortune to the task, and is, we believe, prepared so to devote them still. The dream of his boyhood came to him through the 'gates of horn.' We think that our Academic bodies might have shown the usual recognition of labours, to them so invaluable, by the honorary degree. It was murmured in such circles that the impediment was some notion of seeming committed to his theories. The Vice-Chancellor, proctors, and doctors, it was whispered, were afraid of finding themselves 'owl-headed' or 'cow-headed.' Surely the scruple was needless. It was possible to recognise the sagacity, perseverance, and devotion of the greatest man in his own line, successful himself and the cause of success in others, and leave theory an open question still. The still progressing excavations at Olympia may be regarded as a direct corollary of Dr. Schliemann's success at

Hissarlik. The suggestion of Mommsen, to exhume Olympia, had lain, we believe, for years before the German Government. On seeing what the great pioneer had done, they took heart for the work. A private individual had dug up dead Troy and was digging up dead Greece. They saw that 'spades were trumps' and fell to it with a will, and it will now probably not stand still until thoroughly done.

---

#### ART. VI.

#### HOW CAN CATHEDRALS BEST FURTHER THE CULTURE OF CHURCH MUSIC?

1. *Reports of Church Congresses.* (Papers on Church Music.)
2. *Transition Period of Musical History.* By J. HULLAH. (London, 1878.)
3. *Choral Service of the Church.* By Dr. JEBB. (London, 1843.)

AT a time like the present, when the very word 'institution' is assumed to be a term of evil omen, or at least would appear to be defined as 'a body whose right to exist is challenged,' the subject of Cathedral institutions cannot fail to be much before the public. They have active enemies and they have enthusiastic friends. On the one hand, there are those who consider them, as they have been hitherto worked, a weak point in the Church system; on the other, there are those who foresee what strongholds of faith, and in many ways also promoters of art, they might be if all their resources of influence were in every direction properly and freely developed. Taken as a whole, the subject is not only one of great difficulty, but of large scope, touching as it necessarily must on a great variety of questions, political, ecclesiastical, and artistic, and branching out into that chief of all *cruces* in practical administration—the question of *patronage*. On the first two of these aspects of the subject much has been written and said, and opinions, at all events among Churchmen, are beginning to be tolerably well formed; but on the third, namely, that of the benefit that cathedrals might be to art, comparatively little has been written. It is a field of thought open to much useful discussion, and practical suggestions would no doubt be welcomed by those who have the welfare of cathedrals at heart.

But of those arts which bring, or should bring, their best efforts as offerings at our venerable and beautiful shrines—the works of the builder, the painter, the sculptor, and the musician—it is only on the last that we have now to speak.

The musical influence of a cathedral over the town and neighbourhood in which it is placed might be thought a trifling matter compared with its moral and religious influence; but on consideration it will be found that the two cannot well be separated. Happily for the onward and upward progress of humanity, art and religion are ever mutually attracted to each other; for, in seeking to find means of expressing its higher and nobler aspirations, art naturally has recourse to those pure channels and limitless regions which religion only is able to unfold and exhibit. The converse of this may also be asserted—namely, that when, in a period of low ideals of morality, religion has been despoiled of her true functions and high calling, art has sometimes absorbed and purified religion until the two have been welded into one existence. It is easy to say that all this has become a mere truism; but in fact, the true influence of music has received little attention from those who talk and think about the effects of art education, although many of the finest minds in the country have had much to say about the scope of the sister arts.

To lay it down as a maxim that no truly high form of public worship can exist without the use of music, would formerly, perhaps, have been looked upon as the outburst of an unpractical enthusiast. In these days it might not be deemed so absurd; indeed, it might even be largely acquiesced in. Certain schools of religious thought have made a long and desperate struggle to eliminate from public worship all that is emotional or sensuous, in short, all that is included in the term 'esthetical'; but whatever may have thus far been their success with regard to painting and sculpture, against music their attacks have failed utterly. Daily evidence proves that humanity has no intention of renouncing in its worship that nobler and sweeter speech called music. You may get people to give up piecemeal all outward forms of the beautiful, until they are willing to worship in a barn or at a street corner; but they will sing. If music is the only art with the beauty of which they are acquainted, you cannot persuade them to leave it in the church porch during service, like an overcoat or a wet umbrella. If this demand of music to be admitted into our Church services be allowed, it is to our cathedrals that we naturally turn first for an example of its best use. But no sooner is the duty of cathedrals in this

respect brought forward than a question arises as to what Church music really is; and it will be found very difficult to proceed until it has been to some extent answered. Of course the expression 'Church music' covers two well-marked subdivisions—cathedral music and parish music. It is to be hoped that it will ere long be understood to include also the long-exiled oratorio, but on this more will be said hereafter.

Many of those into whose hands these pages come are doubtless familiar with the chief varieties of style in our cathedral music. As this variety of style is more marked in the anthems than in the settings of the canticles, we will first say a few words about the former of these two most important elements of cathedral music. Even occasional visitors to our cathedrals must have learnt to distinguish between—(1) the pure vocal style, in which Orlando Gibbons excelled; (2) the mixed vocal and instrumental type of anthem, with short independent symphonies, called *ritornelli*, of which Henry Purcell left so many specimens; (3) a later school growing out of the two former, in which Boyce distinguished himself; and, (4) and lastly, a modern form, in which the function of the organ is largely extended, and a more descriptive or realistic style predominates. It is a misfortune that so few examples of the early or pure vocal style exist. It was founded on the choicest Italian models; and, by the firm hold it took after the Reformation, promised well for the future of English cathedral music. Its career was practically brought to a close when our greatest musical genius, Henry Purcell, was, immediately after the Restoration, sent over to France in order to be instructed in and imbued with the vulgar and flimsy style popular at the French Court. The incalculable mischief which this importation of French thought brought upon our national Church music has never been fully realised, partly because its vices were overshadowed by the genius of a Purcell, partly because some of the very worst specimens of its class have been so drummed into the ears of cathedral-goers that they seem unable to live without them. What would be said to a modern composer who in sober seriousness set the sublime words, 'I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, which stood before the throne,' &c., to music commencing with a trifling and undignified scrap of melody for the organ, to be immediately repeated by a single alto voice? This initial *motif* is also ingeniously constructed to lie just where a male alto has a distinct 'break' between two registers of voice; and so, as the notes are about equally divided on either side of

this break, the enunciation of these solemn words sounds as if the composer had wedded them to a grotesquely incoherent duet between a flute and a bagpipe. Yet this anthem is in constant use in our cathedrals, and would probably be selected by many organists as one of the best in the French style.

Nor did our more truly English school of anthems, which combined in many ways the good characteristics of former styles, pay much more regard to the real force of words, or to the most appropriate way of clothing them in sounds. Perhaps Boyce's 'By the waters of Babylon' is the best known specimen of this class; but even in this, notwithstanding its many beauties, the same serious blot may be discovered; for when the poet, in the bitterness of his spirit, cries with a mysterious outpouring of human detestation and abhorrence, 'O daughter of Babylon, wasted with misery, yea, happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us,' the musician broaches the liveliest possible subject *fugato* solely for the purpose of producing a bright and pleasurable musical climax. Gounod, in his setting of the same Psalm, has not thus missed the point of the words; he has, perhaps, even erred, though in the right direction, by giving them the realistic force of an angry execration.

We are not here indicating the faults of our anthem-writers of the French and English schools for the purpose of indiscriminately condemning them as a whole, but rather in the hope of weaning the affections of those who are so rapt up in them that they see no merits in our young modern writers, and use every effort to discourage the production of their works. Our cathedrals cannot in any sense further the culture of Church music by checking its natural growth, but by directing and tempering its course. It may, no doubt, be truly urged that our young writers are too fond of high colouring, and are often too realistic; but, on the other hand, the earlier writers have either used no colouring at all, or have, when they attempted a sound-picture, used the wrong colours. The only safe course to pursue in our cathedrals with regard to the selection of anthems is to retain the best specimens of older schools, and at the same time offer every encouragement to young composers to supply the constantly increasing want of Church music. Although this dictum would appear to be self-evident, it is quite extraordinary how few musicians and amateurs are able to abstain from the temptation of making themselves champions of some particular style. About fifty years since a very strong section of musicians in this country tried hard to prove that no



music, strictly speaking, could be called Church music unless written in the pure vocal or Italian style. But, probably in consequence of the small quantity of music of this school available for English use, the French school was afterwards included, brought in under the wing of Purcell. The next step could not, of course, be logically avoided, and the English school of last century was also included in their repertory. But beyond this they resolutely refused to enlarge their definition of Church music. The whole musical power of our cathedrals was, until quite lately, in the hands of organists holding these opinions; and so unreservedly did they abuse new anthems that they succeeded in making the word 'modern' almost synonymous with 'secular.' The result might have been anticipated. These purists gradually pared down their lists of 'real' Church music until a mere handful of anthems were in use, and were repeated week by week *ad nauseam*. Of course, in deference to the wishes of some ladies who attended the cathedral services regularly, Mendelssohn's 'Oh, rest in the Lord,' and Spohr's 'As pants the hart,' were occasionally heard, but with a few such exceptions nothing was allowed to disturb the dull and cold respectability of an attenuated cycle of 'old favourites.'

We ought to say, however, that two additional facts deserve to be recorded in this sketch of the musical state of our cathedrals just prior to the present renaissance. First, each organist made a mental reservation that his own compositions did not contain the vices of modernism, and they were performed much to the delight of regular worshippers, who hardly could find words wherewith to extol the talent of their local musician, who could positively produce some music which was not exactly like that by Blow or Green. The second fact, if less amusing, is of more importance—namely, that the small quantity of the music used in a regular routine became so familiar, both to singing-men and singing-boys, that the organist could always on week-days be absent from his post, either for his pleasure or profit, leaving a youthful article-pupil to preside at the organ; moreover, no full choir-practices could be needed, or demanded, when the music was so often repeated that it 'taught itself,' and the labour of training the choir boys was in the same way reduced to a minimum. Thus the purity of taste on which such champions of the old school so prided themselves not only saved them a vast amount of trouble, but added largely to their income.

As to the canticles, but little need be said. It is probable that from the year 1600 to 1800 not more than six or eight

settings of the *Te Deum* were produced, which are barely tolerable. The causes of this are identical with those just pointed out as rendering anthem music so long stationary and soulless. In some cases the cathedral 'services,' as canticles are called, are framed for the purpose of getting through the words with undue haste; in others they are mere concatenations of exercises in close *imitation*; in scarcely any is an attempt made to do justice to the words, while in several, positive violence is done to their meaning. In this department also living Church composers have made a praiseworthy, and on the whole a successful effort to fill up the gap caused by the idleness or want of taste of their predecessors; and here again they have sometimes laid themselves open to the charge of being too realistic, and of having attempted to drive home the meaning of the words by wedding them to music so descriptive or picturesque as to tempt hearers away from their consideration rather than attract them towards it. The same excuse must again be made; at the present time a very necessary reaction is taking place against the old theory that all kinds and characters of words—prayer, praise, or narrative—can be worthily sung to the same style of music, because that style happens in itself to be pure. In the sister art of painting a similar theory was brought forward, and maintained almost to an absurdity, some years since. It may be remembered that Sir Joshua Reynolds found serious fault with the painter West for not having dressed Penn and the Indians like Greek gods and goddesses. Reynolds had long made up his mind that no more elegant or artistic dress than that of the Greeks had ever existed; therefore, why not put it on Quakers and savages in a picture? The analogy is apparent. The Italian style of vocal part-music is pure and artistic; therefore, why not clothe words of all kinds in it? So things stood half a century ago, and the least that can be said is that a revolution in our cathedral system of music was inevitable; the only question was whence should the revolution come, and in what direction would it tend.

As not uncommonly happens, it commenced in a quarter, and arose from causes, from which it was least expected. The increased activity in Church work, and growing interest in its services, which constituted a 'revival' in this century, naturally led to the formation of a large number of parish choirs. While cathedral music slept, these choirs had been quietly but steadily improving. The directors of these hard-working and often enthusiastic bodies were not hampered by those noble traditions whose loss we are so often asked to

deplorable; moreover, they could see and appreciate the fact that the cathedral purists, in their great anxiety to train the growing sapling of Church music into a straight tree, had so bound it round and round with their rigid rules of conventional art that it was fairly throttled. Tasteful critics pronounced it, indeed, to be most correctly straight, but it was lifeless. The parish choirs worked on their own lines; from time to time several of them desired to join for a service of united praise. When the selection of music was made, an anthem was required; the nearest cathedral organist was duly and respectfully consulted; he promptly referred them to the works of Blow or Green. What could be better? A musical setting of the canticles was required; the same authority referred them to Gibbons. Some parish choirs had the audacity to start a choral celebration of Holy Communion. Where was the music for the *Sanctus* and *Gloria in Excelsis*? Here the cathedral musician was for a time puzzled; he had never heard of such a thing as a choral celebration. But his purity of taste came to the rescue; he could recommend the *Sanctus* and *Gloria* by Thomas Tallis. It was true that this was probably written about the year 1550, and might be a little antiquated; it was also in the key of *D minor Dorico*, a somewhat obsolete scale; but the music was in the real Church style. It is needless to say that neither parish choirs nor parish congregations were willing in this their youth of spiritual life to embrace music which offered correctness of diction in the place of fitness of thought, and, instead of beauty in art, presented them only with ingenuity in artifice. Young composers were then appealed to, who, despite the adverse criticism of the old cathedral organists, which they knew awaited their productions, did their best to supply music bright and melodious, true to the gist of the text, free from difficulties of performance. If all the works written with these ends in view may not be of the very highest type, it must still be acknowledged that it was to this alliance of young composers with *parish* choirs that the present renaissance of Church music entirely owes its existence. The credit must not be given to a certain few well-known men, albeit full of genius, who, while calling loudly for progress, and while uniformly depreciating other men's efforts, successfully avoided the soiling of a shoulder against the rut-locked wheel. For ten or fifteen years the only good cathedral service in London was to be heard in a small, insignificant-looking parish church in Wells Street, Oxford Street. Let parish choirs see to it, lest history rob them of their due reward for having put

cathedrals to the blush by their noble example. The sort of music required by these churches was soon forced upon cathedral notice, and has tended in no small degree to mould what may be called the modern school of cathedral music. The first way, therefore, in which we may hope for the special culture of Church music in our cathedrals is, as may be gathered from the above historical sketch, by encouraging modern writers, while at the same time preserving and doing justice to the best specimens of former schools of music.

Next in importance to this stands unquestionably the duty of encouraging congregational music: a duty the true weight of which has only comparatively lately forced itself upon any of our cathedral authorities. The easiest and best means would seem to be to establish one service on each Sunday, probably in the evening, at which the words of the hymns should be gratuitously distributed, headed by a special invitation to the congregation to join in the singing. To get hearty hymn-singing is not so easy in a cathedral as in a parish church. In the latter, familiarity with the position of their seats and the faces of those around them, also with the clergy and the method of conducting the services, tends to make all worshippers tolerably at their ease; while in the former, people always seem to consider themselves more or less as visitors, and, on finding themselves surrounded by strangers, feel chilled by a sense of propriety and need of decorum, which makes them dread lest by singing out boldly and loudly they may appear ridiculous. When once these groundless misgivings are removed, it will be discovered that hymn-singing in cathedrals is not only a source of genuine edification to the singers, but also of sublime musical effects. There is one further advantage in these congregational services which must not be overlooked; by their means it is possible to interest a large number of amateur musicians in cathedral work. To lead the voices of the congregation, a voluntary choir should be formed. If the material which comes to hand is not of the best, a few professional singers may be with advantage added. It will, however, always be found difficult to sustain the existence of a voluntary choir for any length of time, if simple music to the canticles, and hymn tunes, are the only musical sustenance provided for them. In order to retain a hold upon them, it will be found almost necessary to introduce at the weekly rehearsals the study of glees, madrigals, cantatas, and oratorios. The interest thus excited will prove of twofold benefit. In the first place, it will ensure regularity of attendance on the part of

the members of the choir; next, it will, by educating and elevating their musical taste, act indirectly in a most favourable way on the general excellence of their performance in the cathedral. Into these congregational services no cathedral music proper should be admitted; for, if once this is done, the congregation will immediately constitute itself an audience, and continue for the remainder of the time obstinately silent. Under the most promising conditions it is often a matter of no small difficulty to get an English congregation to sing properly. By the vast number of people it is considered etiquette to keep the head well down whilst joining in a hymn, and to make no effort whatever to articulate the words. To watch such persons would almost give the impression that they were holding secret conversation with the buttons of their waistcoats. But, happily, this tradition is on the wane, and we may yet in time hold our own against the hearty singing of the Germans in their chorals. It would be hardly fair to leave this portion of our subject without suggesting that the broadest and grandest tunes should be selected for large congregations in preference to the sweet or sentimental. Composers of the present day have been much blamed for allowing their tunes to drift into 'sacred part-songs.' But surely authors and translators of words must share with them the discredit of this decadence of style. If any hymnary be examined, it will be observed that the music has a great tendency to rise and fall with the merits of the words. Give a composer stanzas of weak sentimentalism, and he will, with an eye to congruity, very naturally clothe them in that weak sentimental music which his good sense would never permit him to attach to straightforward masculine thoughts.

There still remains a third way in which the culture of Church music may be furthered by our cathedrals, although it is to be regretted that opinions as to its advisability are not at one. The real question at issue is this: Ought the concert room or the church to be the home of the oratorio? On the one hand, it is an indisputable fact that these great musical works were first produced in churches, deriving, as they do, their very name from the Church of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri in Rome; and it may, therefore, be assumed that they were cultivated with the primary intention of enforcing in a musical and quasi-dramatic way the doctrine and teaching of the Church. On the other hand, we in these days have to face the fact that the long association of oratorios with our concert rooms has environed them with secular associations, which are with difficulty dispelled. Unfortunately, the public

has been taught that soft, comfortable, reserved sittings can be purchased for oratorio performances; that all who choose may remain seated throughout; that certain ladies and gentlemen in evening dress will appear on a platform and respond with amiable smiles to hearty rounds of applause, this hand-clapping being repeated after every musical effort they may make; that it is not irreverent or incongruous to shout 'encore' when pleased; also, that twenty minutes' pause in the middle of the work is a nice time for chat among friends in the audience, and useful for the performers who may happen to need refreshment; and, lastly, that it is clever and desirable to rise and leave the room during the performance of the final chorus, the discomfort to those who wish to remain to the end, and the complete ruin of the composer's supreme climax, being as nothing with the luxury of 'getting away nicely.' How completely all such ideas have to be swept away before people can be taught to listen reverently to an oratorio in church it need not be pointed out. That the hearing of an oratorio may be turned into an act of worship can be easily proved by any who will take the trouble to make personal experiment, and there is less chance of wandering thoughts if such a performance be ushered in by prayer and closed by a Benediction. It is quite certain that all who have once discovered the beauty and edification of such services return to an oratorio in a concert room with very decisive opinions as to its unfitness for the place. This feeling is daily becoming more widely spread, but there still remains, as an obstruction to the adoption of oratorios in churches, a curious antipathy to the appearance of orchestral instruments within sacred walls. The sight of a fiddle or a harp in God's house is still a stumbling-block to many. They, perhaps, have seen this same combination of instruments used outside a tavern door, and the association scandalises them. Others may get beyond this stage, but cannot reconcile themselves to a trombone; its eccentric and, to them, unaccountable movements as the tube slides in and out, distract and irritate them. There are others, again, who cannot tolerate a pianoforte (in the place of the obsolete harpischord) in Bach's Passion music. The objections to this instrument in church are simply unaccountable, for a pianoforte is highly respectable, and could produce testimonials as to its good behaviour from all the best drawing-rooms in the country. If the objectors to orchestral instruments in church on the ground of their frequent secular use will study their Bibles closely, they will find that no such affectation troubled the Hebrews.



It is a remarkable fact that the instruments mentioned in connection with revels and debauchery, which called forth the indignation of more than one holy prophet, are identical with those used in the worship of the Temple. Of course it is necessary to prevent, before the commencement of an oratorio in church, that extraordinary symphony of cacophony known as the tuning of an orchestra; this tuning can be quite as efficiently done in an almost noiseless way, especially by experienced performers.

It is an easy thing to procure the services of a fine band in the metropolis and other large cities, if money is forthcoming, but the expense of getting instrumentalists to some provincial towns is exceedingly heavy. This at once suggests that local amateurs should be organised and drilled for the purpose of forming the nucleus of a cathedral orchestra. Large numbers of enthusiasts can be easily found who would patiently undergo any amount of drilling in order to qualify themselves for such important and interesting duties. These, led by a few professional 'principals,' would form a fairly good band at a small cost. The number of voices employed must of course vary according to circumstances, but it may be safely said that there are but few cathedrals in which 250 or 300 voices are not ample for grand effects. The introduction of female voices is a question of much difficulty. The task of finding in a small town a sufficient number of trained boys to do justice to the soprano part of a grand chorus would in nearly all cases be hopeless. Yet the question may be asked, *Why* should not women take the part for which nature has fitted them in the worship of God? Is publicity or 'conspicuousness' an objection? We reply that they need *not* be placed so as to be 'conspicuous:' neither is it necessary for them to dress in highly coloured or curiously designed costumes which invite observation. All other members of the choir, and if possible of the band also, should be surpliced. A sober and uniform attire for all women thus aiding in Cathedral performances would destroy at once that sense of being personally conspicuous which every right-minded woman abhors; and it would not only destroy the sense of it, but it would also destroy the reality. Where oratorios are properly and reverently performed as part of a service, it will not only be found that each oratorio is of value as a vehicle of instruction in the true and beautiful, but also that by a judicious selection a cycle may be formed which will illustrate the teaching of the Church seasons, and, in our judgment, tend powerfully to the kindling of devotional feel-

ing. In Advent might be sung the *Last Judgment*, by Spohr, Mendelssohn's *Hymn of Praise*, the movements of the *Dies Irae* from Mozart's *Requiem*; at Christmas, a portion of Bach's *Christmas Oratorio*, or Handel's *Messiah*; during Lent, one of Bach's settings of the *Passion*, or a *Passion-music* by Handel, Graun, or Haydn; at Easter, portions of the *Messiah*, or Sullivan's *Light of the World*, &c. This list might be almost indefinitely extended, but enough has been said to show how the highest works of music may be rendered subsidiary to the eternal truths of our religion for the common good.

We have now briefly shown three ways in which cathedrals may further the culture of Church music—namely, by presenting to the world the highest type of cathedral, congregational, and oratorio music. In striving thus to reach a high standard of excellence, precentors will find that their posts, so frequently looked upon as honourable sinecures, call forth high responsibilities and constant hard work, while organists will be grateful to their precentors for leaving their hands unfettered to deal with purely musical questions by relieving them of much collateral toil. Fortunately for the patience of the reader, the relations between precentor and organist do not strictly come within the scope of our subject, except in a negative manner—that is, if ever the relations between these two officers become what diplomatists term 'strained,' the culture of Church music must in the end be injuriously affected. When there is complete understanding and mutual confidence between them there can be no doubt that considerable benefit must accrue to the ends which both are conscientiously striving to reach. As to the necessity of carefully tending the education of chorister boys, all are now agreed; they should be, if possible, gathered under one roof, and gently trained by those whose knowledge of character and experience of the world have taught them the peculiarly sensitive nature of children gifted with musical talent, and daily breathing, as it were, the atmosphere of emotions and highly wrought sensuousness. It is inevitable that chorister boys cannot, with their frequent disturbances of routine work, hope to run a race with boys in ordinary schools; but, if their musical training has been on a true basis, and their taste for the beautiful in sounds directed aright and quickened into a new sense, they will have received a lasting source of joy in after life, which they would not barter for any rare book-lore or any rewards held out by those who frame artificial standards for gauging the results of education. The question of what should be done with boys who show signs of musical genius

is of no less direct importance than that of their primary schooling. It has been customary to apprentice a promising lad to the organist of the cathedral where he was trained as a boy. The advisability of doing so is open to grave doubts. If he should remain hovering round the old spot and clinging to the old associations, there is much fear that he will drift into some small groove of thought, or fix his ambition on some easily obtainable status. Much better would it be to send him either to some sound school of music in our own capital, or to one of the many admirable *conservatoires* in Germany. It is much to be hoped that our Universities will some day awake to the necessity of providing as good an education in music as in any other subjects. When this has been brought about, a joint education in music and *in literis humanioribus* would be the best reward a Dean and Chapter could offer to a talented boy who had deserved well. Thus, indeed, would they further the culture of Church music in the highest sense; and they would probably be amply rewarded by finding in after years the now highly developed and fully trained musician hover around and finally build his nest near those walls in which he had so often sweetly sung that he would rather be a door-keeper in them than dwell outside in worldly luxury; and doubtless to the service of the sanctuary he would devote every whit of the talents entrusted to his charge. If our cathedral authorities could bring a few score of such men to the front, there could be, under God's blessing, but little doubt or anxiety as to the future of Church music. As it is, far too often the pretty little boy who has filled the church with persons who have deeply felt the influence and charms of his tender budding genius is lost sight of when the romance of boyhood has departed, and when, for want of further means of education, he seems likely to become only an ordinary man, although so lately an extraordinary boy. Perhaps the real reason for this cold neglect after daily eulogy has yet to be told: another boy has been found to take his place.

In conclusion, it must be said that, although much has yet to be done, there is cause for sincere thankfulness at the present improved state of cathedral music. The fruit of hard work at the hands of young unbiassed musicians, and of more genuine sympathy in such work from those in authority, is beginning to show itself on all sides.

# ART. VII.—THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE GALLICAN CHURCH.

1. *La Réforme Catholique et l'Eglise Anglicane etc., de* HYACINTHE LOYSON, *Prêtre.* (Paris, 1879.)
2. *The Petition of Père HYACINTHE to the Episcopate assembled at Lambeth, and the Answer of the Episcopate.*

A QUESTION of no mean importance is now raised in our branch of the Catholic Church. It is expedient to prepare the way for the discussion of the particular subject by the consideration of some general principles applicable to what might be called the international relations of Churches in different countries.

It is, on the one hand, most desirable that no usage generally respected in the Catholic Church should be violated or disturbed by the adverse action of any one portion of that Church,<sup>1</sup> *aliis inconsultis*. It is, on the other hand, the duty of each branch of the Church not to refuse to administer any succour or aid in her power to another branch, which from local or peculiar circumstances is labouring under an unjust denial of the privileges incident to a Christian Church. May we not go a step further and say that a Christian congregation (or part of a church) unjustly deprived of rites and sacraments incident to the *fidelium communio*, may, after having vainly sought relief from the branch of the Catholic Church in the country in which it happens to be, be entitled to the assistance of a Church in a foreign land?

This is really the question presented by Père Hyacinthe to the Anglican Episcopate, and by their reply.

We think it very desirable that the documents themselves should be laid *in extenso* before our readers.

<sup>1</sup> In the *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, of Thomassinus, there is a chapter (xxix. T. i. 99) on the occasional necessity of appointing two bishops in one see, or two parish priests in one parish. He instances the case of inhabitants speaking different languages, especially in Greek territories, such as Cyprus (now the object of so much interest); the necessity of relaxing the general rule proceeded from the fact that, after the conquest of the Crusaders in the East, Latin bishops were forced upon Greek sees.

<sup>4</sup> *To the Most Reverend the LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY, President of the Commission constituted by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, to consider the relations between the "Old Catholics" and others who have separated themselves from the Roman Communion :*

*London, August 4, 1878.*

'Most Reverend Father in Christ,—At length, when, after a long and grievous period of waiting, the prayers of many hearts have been answered, and France is open to the preaching of another Catholicism than that of the Vatican, I have felt it my duty, as a Catholic priest, to come to the aid of so many minds which, in the midst of great dangers and of great sufferings, are struggling against the two contrary currents of superstition and infidelity. I have held several conferences in Paris, which have been attended by large and attentive audiences. The moment seems to me to have arrived for uniting under one and the same banner, and, above all, in one and the same sanctuary, those of my fellow-countrymen who desire to re-unite themselves to the principles of the ancient Catholic Church, so long and so gloriously preserved in the Gallican Church.

'Unhappily, evil days have made our Episcopate such that we count in its ranks many adversaries, and we have not one to exercise pastoral superintendence over us. And yet in France more than elsewhere it is of essential importance that the restorative action should come from above—I mean, from the power established by God for the government of His Church. Without this, instead of reform we should have revolution; and should not heal the evils of ecclesiastical absolutism by introducing those of religious anarchy in their stead. Recent events have only strengthened this conviction, which is with me of long standing; and it is this which causes me to turn towards you, most Reverend Father in Christ—towards you who have been placed, by the providence of God, in the oldest see of an Episcopate which not only embraces in its powerful circle the vast area of the Anglo-Saxon world, but which also dates back in an uninterrupted and unbroken succession to the Apostles.

'We have heard with emotion and gratitude the words in which, during their recent conference, the Bishops of the Anglican communion have so generously offered their support in the isolation and spiritual conflict in which we are engaged:—"We do not demand a rigid uniformity; we deprecate needless divisions; but to those who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition, we are ready to offer all help, and such privileges as may be acceptable to them, and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles as enunciated in our formularies."

'We thank you for these words, and we believe with the Anglican Episcopate, that if each Bishop has received individually the charge of a particular Church, all Christian Bishops have received collectively "*in solidum*," as St. Cyprian of Carthage so well expresses it, the care of the Universal Church. Hence it was that in ancient times they never refused to the neighbouring Christian bodies the help which they demanded of them in their time of need. We ask you to

help us to maintain ourselves upon the basis you have yourselves indicated in the document just quoted, as that of the Catholic Union of Churches, viz. :—"One Divine Head ; One Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in holy writ, defined in the creeds, and maintained by the Primitive Church ; one and the same Canon of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation."

'Public conferences, more or less philosophical and polemical, do not suffice for the work we are undertaking. What we need, above all things, is liturgical worship and evangelical preaching. We desire to re-establish, as speedily as possible, the use of the ancient Gallican Liturgies adapted to our present necessities, following the principles which are common to us both, and which are set forth in your "Letter." The strength of a Church lies not only in the symbol of its faith, but also in its Book of Prayer.

'Above and beyond the material aid which is necessary to us for the worthy celebration of public worship, that which we most earnestly desire is the official recognition of the Catholic work of the priests and laity who are endeavouring to restore, upon a basis at once larger and more ancient than that of the Council of Trent, the Gallican Church, which has been officially suppressed by the Vatican Council. We ask to be recognised by the Anglican communion as forming in France a Christian mission—Catholic and Gallican—placed provisionally under the government of one or several of its Bishops, until the day when it shall be possible for us to constitute ourselves a complete and autonomous Church.

'Count Joseph de Maistre, an Ultramontane in heart and in spirit, has written thus in his *Considérations sur la France* :—"If ever the time should come when Christians should draw towards each other, as everything invites them to do, it seems as if the movement must emanate from the Anglican Church. She may be considered as one of those solvents capable of uniting elements that otherwise would be unable to combine." Permit me, Most Reverend Father in Christ, to conclude with these memorable words, which express at once a duty and a prophecy.

'In the hope that they maybe realised by you and by us, in England and in France, I now sign myself your very humble and very devoted servant and son in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Catholic Church,

'HYACINTHE LOYSON, *Priest.*'

'To R. & R. HYACINTHE LOYSON.

'*Hedgefield House, Inverness, Sept. 25, 1878.*

'Reverend and dear Sir,—I have been requested and authorised by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other members of the Committee nominated by the recent Lambeth Conference, to confer with you on the subject of your letter of August 4, addressed to his Grace as President of that Committee. It has seemed good to the members of that Committee, with the view of obviating



the inconveniences and possible delay which might arise from the difficulty of bringing together its different members, and as the best mode of providing the aid which you are seeking, to select one of their number to whom they might refer you for guidance and direction. Recalling the traditional alliance and friendly relations which formerly existed between France and Scotland, the selection of a Scottish Bishop as the medium of reviving such friendly relations, and of establishing, if it please God, an alliance between our ancient Churches, on a higher and more enduring basis than even that which now so happily exists between our two countries, may perhaps be as acceptable to you, Reverend Sir, and to those of your countrymen who are associated with you in this religious movement, as it is pleasing to myself.

‘I have before me your letter to the Archbishop, and I gather from it that the object which you and those who are acting with you are seeking to accomplish, is, not the formation of some new Protestant sect, but the initiation of the Reform, both in doctrine and discipline, of your own old Church of France, on the same primitive and Catholic principles as those on which the Church of England reformed itself in the sixteenth century; to re-assert its national independence, and to recover for it those liberties and that freedom which have been crushed out by a foreign and unauthorised usurpation. That to prevent such Reform from degenerating into Ecclesiastical revolution you desire to be directed and governed by an authoritative Episcopal oversight, strong enough to keep out of the movement all un-Catholic and Rationalistic elements; and that, failing to obtain such oversight and guidance from any one of your National Bishops, you turn to the Anglican Episcopate, asking from it the recognition of your Mission in France, and that your priests and laymen may be placed provisionally under one or several of its Bishops, until you may be able to constitute yourselves a complete and autonomous Church.

‘In ordinary times, and under ordinary circumstances, the Anglican Episcopate could have returned but one answer to such a request. They would have been constrained to decline acceding to it as being in violation of the Canonical Rule and Order of the Catholic Church, that no Bishop or Priest of any other Church should exercise his functions in the diocese of another Bishop without the consent of the Bishop thereof. But the times are not ordinary times. Never since the agitation of the sixteenth century has there been such a wide-spread religious and ecclesiastical movement as that which marks the present day. It is not, as then, limited to Europe, but it is felt in all parts of the world. Attendant upon this religious movement there has arisen a wide-spread spirit of scepticism and scientific doubt, which aims at sapping the very foundations of the Church of Christ. At such a moment as this, and under circumstances such as these, the whole body of the Church may fairly turn to the Christian Episcopate for guidance and instruction. For such guidance and direction you, Reverend Sir, and your brethren have turned to the Anglican Episcopate, and have asked their sympathy and aid in the peculiar cir-

circumstances and pressing difficulties under which you labour. Nor are you alone in thus looking for aid to the Anglican Episcopate. The fact came before the Lambeth Conference that solemn protests had been raised in many Churches and Christian communities throughout the world against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and against the novel doctrines promulgated by its authority, and that appeals had been made by them also for the intervention of the Anglican Episcopate in difficulties similar to your own. Application from members of Churches thus circumstanced to Bishops not under the same bondage was felt by the Conference to be justifiable, while a consideration of the position of these Christian communities rendered hopeless by the recent decree of the Vatican Council, in any effort to reform themselves unless aided from without, seems to make the line of duty to be pursued by such Bishops towards their struggling brethren only the more clear and definite. For their position is this: The demand which has been made and repeated for centuries by many of the most eminent and faithful adherents of the Church of Rome, for Reform both in 'Head and Members,' has at length been met, though it cannot be silenced, by the claim of an Authority assuming to itself the prerogative of Infallibility, which has decreed that all the definitions of doctrine on faith and morals by the Roman Pontiff are irreformable. This decree, being from its very nature retrospective as well as prospective, has for ever closed the door against every effort for Reform by those Churches or Members of the Roman Communion who, protesting against an authority which invades the attributes of the Lord Jesus Christ, and against the novel and un-Catholic doctrines which have been promulgated by its authority, are seeking to reform themselves on the model of the Primitive Church, and who are refused all aid and sympathy by their own Bishops.

While prepared, therefore, to sympathise with any movement for Reform which is in harmony with those principles on which the Church of England reformed itself, and to express its readiness to aid those Churches and Communities which, under such insuperable difficulties, are striving to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition, the Conference was not unmindful of the Canonical Rule of the Church to which I have already referred, and of the respect which is due to the legitimate action of Church Order in the different provinces and dioceses in Christendom. The general principle which the Lambeth Conference affirmed, with special reference to the Churches of the Anglican Communion, applies with equal force to the Catholic Church everywhere, viz.:—The legitimate action of National Churches, and the authority of Bishops in their own dioceses. But this principle assumes the rightful liberty and independence of National Churches and their Bishops—a principle which is, however, entirely traversed by the present Constitution of the Church of Rome. The application of those principles of Church Order which are essential for discipline in ordinary times, are, however, subject to modification or suspension when the necessities of the Church demand the application of a principle of yet higher obligation. Hence we find from the teaching and practice of some of

the most eminent Fathers and Bishops of the Primitive Church, that whenever the faith was endangered by heresy or persecution, and heretical Bishops would ordain none but heretical clergy, they did not hesitate to act in virtue of the commission which the Episcopate has received from Christ for the preservation of the faith and government of His Church, and to ordain orthodox men in such dioceses, though contrary to the common rule of the Church. They asked for no dispensation from the Bishop of Rome, or from any other Bishop; but as members of the one Episcopate to which Christ had entrusted the preservation of the Faith, and as Catholic Bishops of the Universal Church, they felt themselves bound, individually, to exercise their Episcopal power in any part of the world where the necessities of the Church required it and the Faith was endangered.

'It was in virtue of this great commission which the Episcopate has received from Christ for the preservation of the Faith and the Government of His Church, and for the protection of those who should suffer for it, that the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, convened at Lambeth, authorised a Committee of their own number to offer such help as they might need to those Churches and Christian communities which, seeking to free themselves from the intolerable yoke of Papal usurpation, and from the compulsory acceptance of novel and un-Catholic doctrines enforced upon them by their own Bishops, were striving to reform themselves on the model of the Primitive Church, and should appeal to them for assistance. As members of a Church thus circumstanced you and your brethren have availed yourselves of this offer and have appealed to that Committee.

'As I intimated to you at the commencement of this letter, the Committee, in acknowledgment of your appeal, has authorised me to communicate with you, and has referred you to me for guidance and direction, with the view of providing for you the aid which you need. I am prepared to undertake the work thus far entrusted to me, and by recognising your Mission, based upon the principles enunciated in your letter, and tendering to it a provisional oversight, to place you in a position to confer with me officially on the details of the work in which you are engaged. You will readily understand that it would be impossible for us to pledge ourselves to the administration of Episcopal functions in your Mission until we have had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with your proposed revised Ritual—the order and forms to be observed in the celebration of Divine Service and administration of the Sacraments, and other sacred offices of the Church. "We do not demand," to use the language of the Conference, "we do not demand a rigid uniformity;" nor, I would add, would we desire to abridge in the slightest degree the liberty of a National and Catholic Church to frame its own Liturgy and to decree its own rites and ceremonies. But "*lex Orandi, lex Credendi.*" And if, in compliance with your request, we are to administer Episcopal functions according to your ritual, we can do so only in the event of that ritual, in its language and ceremonies, containing nothing inconsistent with the Word of God, with the principles enunciated in our

own formularies, with the prerogatives of the One Divine Head of the Church, or of the One Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Your proposed revision of your ritual on the basis of the Primitive Gallican Liturgy, adapted to your present necessities, would seem to furnish the best assurance that your reformed Liturgy will embody the principles which, you say, are common to us both, and thus remove any difficulty on this head. I await your further communication on this subject.

‘If, as I hope may prove the case, we may be enabled to provide for you the Provisional Episcopal superintendence which you desire, I trust and earnestly pray that, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit of God, we may be permitted so to guide the movement as shall prevent the possible formation of any such schisms as those which resulted from the refusal on the part of the Bishops to recognise and guide the great religious movement of the 16th century—a guidance and recognition which were as earnestly desired by the Reformers of that day as they are now by yourself and by those who are co-operating with you.

‘I am happy to add that the Bishop of Edinburgh has, at my request, kindly consented to be associated with me in the future conduct of this work.

‘I beg to subscribe myself, Reverend and dear Sir, very faithfully yours in the Lord Jesus Christ,

‘ROBERT, *Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness, Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church.*’

It is only just to say that a more temperate and grave document upon a great subject could not be desired. We recognise in it the practical wisdom, piety, and administrative ability of the Primus of Scotland.

Père Hyacinthe says in effect:—These new doctrines of the Vatican are destructive of the Church: you may trace, since their promulgation, the rapid growth of the two worst evils that can beset her—novelty of doctrine and superstition. The Gallican Church, the Church of my forefathers, hallowed by noble traditions, which the greatest divines of France illustrated by their labours and their talents, lies gagged and bound at the feet of the Vatican councillors. Give me help in the arduous task of endeavouring to set her free, and restoring her to her ancient and Catholic position. The need is urgent—earnest pious men are bewildered, and the turbulent scoffers and the philosophical infidels are destroying her.

So many unjust burdens are laid on men's shoulders they will not bear those that are just, such monstrous novelties are required to be believed, that men take refuge in general scepticism. Come and help us, and delay not. We are no revolutionists, no founders of a new religion, no speculative dreamers.

All we ask is to be enabled '*stare super antiquas vias*' of the Church of Christ.

Must this cry for help go up in vain? because we have fallen on evil days for which there is no precedent, are we to do nothing?

The disease in its present state and terrible magnitude is new: are we to try no remedy?

For what are the dry bones of precedent valuable when the life which once inspired them is gone?

There is surely much weight in the petition thus presented to our Bishops. It cannot be denied that a state of things may possibly arise in one branch of the Church which would justify the intervention of a foreign Episcopate in aiding the congregations of that branch, even without the consent of their proper Bishop.

If, for instance, the Vatican were to insist on belief in the immaculate conception of S. Joseph, or on a dogma that Bossuet, Fénelon, Pascal, D'Aguesseau, and Montalembert are in Purgatory, on account of their infidelity to the Church of Rome, or on a dogma that all the kingdoms of the earth were in the gift of the Pope, and that no other construction, as the Canon law declares, can be put upon the '*Ecce duo gladii*' ('Behold here are two swords')—if the Vatican were to insist on the necessity of a profession of belief in positions such as these—an event unfortunately not only possible, but by no means inconceivable—surely the intervention of a foreign Episcopate would be justifiable.

It is a question, therefore, rather of degree than of principle. That the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was not holden by the Universal Church is plain to any honest reader of authentic history. We cannot easily forget the manner, the look, the tone, and the energy of expression with which the late Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, when, in answer to a question how the Greek Church characterised this dogma, replied,—

'*Neu und falsch.*'<sup>1</sup>

So with regard to the other new dogma of Papal infallibility, it is abundantly, superabundantly, proved never to have been the belief of the Church Universal. A belief in both these dogmata has recently become the condition required by Rome of admittance into her fold. The rise of the Old Catholic Church in Germany, and Père Hyacinthe's attitude of supplication on behalf of the Gallican Church, are the results

<sup>1</sup> His Grace always spoke German or modern Greek.

of this un-Catholic and un-Christian conduct on the part of the Vatican. The necessity of introducing a foreign Episcopate is the fruit—to borrow the expression of Thomassinus on the subject of two Bishops in one see—of an *'ineluctabilis, invictissima necessitas'*—(T. i. p. 100).

The last, but not the least important remark remains to be made. The Vatican has been troubled with no scruples about thrusting strangers into her neighbour's vineyard: there could not be a plainer violation of the principles of Canonical law and the practice of the Church than was afforded by her nomination, not many years ago, of foreign Bishops to exercise episcopal functions in the sees in this country; and only the other day, in the ancient sees of Scotland. The truth is, that the Vatican has never hesitated to be the author of schism in the Church, when her Italian policy seemed to dictate such a course. Witness her base and tortuous conduct to the Greek Church—conduct which has necessitated the appointment of Greek ministers and the erection of Greek churches in almost every Latin country where the Greek race is to be found. On the whole, we venture to commend this question to the immediate and earnest attention of the Church, hoping heartily, and praying humbly, that the evils which attended the Reformation in Germany, when Luther thought himself obliged to break down the ancient discipline of the Church, in order to preserve Evangelical truth, may, by the timely action and succour of the Catholic Episcopate, be averted from the Church of France. And may God grant that the reformation of that Church, which cannot long be delayed, may be built on the restoration of Evangelical truth and Catholic order.

---

#### ART. VIII.—ECCLESIASTICAL BUILDINGS FIRE INSURANCE BILL, 1878.

1. *Report from the Select Committee on Ecclesiastical Buildings (Fire Insurance) Bill, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of the Evidence and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed June 28, 1878.
2. *House of Lords. Church of England Buildings Fire Insurance. A Bill (as amended by the Select Committee and on Report), intituled 'An Act to amend the Ecclesiastical*



*Dilapidations Act, 1871, and to provide for the Insurance against Fire of Buildings belonging to the Church of England.* Presented by Lord EGERTON. Ordered to be printed July 16, 1872.

3. *House of Commons' Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance. A Bill to provide for the Insurance against Fire of Buildings belonging to Ecclesiastical Benefices in England and Wales.* Proposed and brought in by Mr. LEIGHTON, Mr. GOLDNEY, and Mr. WHITWELL, February 4, 1878.
4. *The same, as amended by the Select Committee,* June 28, 1878.
5. *Reports of the Committees to the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Law of Ecclesiastical Dilapidations,* February 6, 1872, and May 3, 1876.
6. *Report from the Select Committee (Mr. Bouverie's) on Queen Anne's Bounty Board.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 1868.
7. *Report from the Select Committee (Mr. Goldney's) on the Law of Ecclesiastical Dilapidations.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 1876.
8. *History of Queen Anne's Bounty.* By CHRISTOPHER HODGSON.

WE heartily wish that Parliament would show as much sagacity in dealing with Church as with general questions. The great majority of members of Parliament are Churchmen as well as landowners or citizens. The clergy like many other classes demand greater freedom from parliamentary interference, and draw the same distinction between the questions which ought to be handled in Parliament, and those which ought to be left under their own control. Believing as we do that the Church, and not Parliament, should initiate legislation on such matters as religious worship, ritual, doctrine, Church extension, and the like, we at the same time recognise the fact that there are other quasi-ecclesiastical matters which cannot be settled without Parliament. In order to obtain freedom in the one case, and good management in the other, Churchmen should not overlook the necessity of a complete parliamentary organisation. The Church party put forth their utmost efforts to save the Irish Church. They were defeated. Untaught as yet, however, by the experience of past defeat, they still seem inclined to act as though they thought that what is everybody's business is sure to be somebody's. They are inclined to trust too implicitly to the ability and loyalty of those who at elections repeat the shibboleth of 'Church

and State.' They are satisfied to remain without a regular parliamentary machinery of their own. Convocation, Church conferences, and synods do not appear to have the slightest influence on any Government. Those in the House of Commons who appear to be well affected towards the Church are inclined to overlook details, and act as though at the present moment there were only two Church questions before them, 'The Burials Question' and 'Disestablishment.' We repeat that there is either real ground for alarm, or else that there is real want of leadership. It is our belief that a better fight will be maintained on both these questions by a contemporaneous consideration of others; and that the habit of acting together on other kindred subjects will enable Churchmen to work together better whenever the main points of their position may be attacked.

Passing from these general observations, it is our object in this article to discuss the issues involved in one of those minor questions which affect the clergy, that is to say, the insurance of ecclesiastical buildings against loss by fire.

The subject has long been familiar to a certain number of active-minded clergymen and laymen, but it is clear that it has never engaged general attention. Parliament would be a very unwise and a very unpopular assembly if it passed laws, however good in themselves, which were not demanded in an unmistakable manner by those whose interests they touched. Successful legislation requires two ingredients—a popular impulse and a sound principle. So, if those, for whose special benefit a new law is proposed, do not take special heed to the legislation, few others are likely to do so, and no Parliament is likely to trouble itself with the furtherance of the work.

That it is an act of prudence almost amounting to a moral obligation for a clergyman to insure the buildings belonging to his benefice, will generally be admitted. Up to the year 1871 considerable discretion in this respect was permitted, and except in those cases where money had been borrowed on the security of a living, an incumbent was under no positive obligation to insure. In that year, however, was passed an Act of Parliament known by the name of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, the 54th section of which runs as follows :—

'Every incumbent shall insure, and during his incumbency keep insured, in the joint names of himself and the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, the house of residence, and farm, and other buildings, outbuildings, and offices belonging to his benefice (including the chancel, when liable to repair it), against loss or damage by fire, in some Insurance Office, or Offices, to be selected by himself, to the

satisfaction of the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, in at least three-fifths of the value thereof; and he shall cause the receipt for the premium for such insurance for each year to be exhibited at the first visitation of the Bishop or Archdeacon next ensuing after the same shall become payable.'

And the 55th section :

'In case of fire, if the Office shall elect to pay the sum insured, instead of causing the buildings to be reinstated at the expense of the office, the sum so paid shall be paid to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, and dealt with as moneys standing to the credit of the dilapidation account.'

In the following year (1872), a Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of the Southern Province was appointed to consider what alterations should be made in the law relating to the Dilapidations of Ecclesiastical Buildings. The members who formed the Committee were the Prolocutor, the Archdeacons of Taunton, Ely, and Berks, the Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton, the Rev. Messrs. Dayman, Fagan, Hopkins, Howell, Sumner, Tatham, Woodgate, and Gibbs (Chairman). In their Report, amongst other valuable suggestions on the main subject of their consideration, they made the following observations on fire insurance :—

'As a class, ecclesiastical buildings are less liable to be burnt down than other buildings, and consequently form one of the most profitable classes of insurance for the Fire Insurance Offices, and yet the same premium is charged for them as for other buildings. It is credibly reported that owners of many houses, instead of insuring them in any Fire Office, become their own insurers, by annually putting aside, or at least saving themselves from paying the amount of premium which the Fire Office would charge. In the event of fire, this saving is available for restoring the damaged building, and the owner has the profit which otherwise would belong to the Office. Your Committee are of opinion that the Church might act as such owner of all its buildings and become its own insurance office. Your Committee therefore recommend that legal provision be sought to enable the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty to act in this matter in behalf of the Church, and to undertake the insurance of all ecclesiastical buildings and their contents against damage by fire, in a method similar to that which is now in operation in connexion with the Fire Offices. Your Committee further recommend that all new incumbents be obliged to insure with the said Governors. The premiums might be paid by the clergy as tenths now are, and be recoverable by the Governors in the same way. The facilities which the office of the Bounty Board affords for this proposed work in connexion with that which it now performs, no less than the kind of property insured, justify the Committee in expecting that these in-

surances might be effected at a less percentage, and also that there would result a profit income applicable to increase the fund for the augmentation of small livings, or to pay the expenses of the surveyors and registrars under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871, or for other Church purposes. The provision here recommended would be especially beneficial to the clergy by diminishing both the trouble and the expense occasioned by the 55th section of the Act; for, as the Governors would know the fact of insurance and could secure the payment of the premium, a proviso might be added that the receipt of the premium of insurance be not exhibited at the visitation, when the insurance has been effected at the office of the Bounty Board. The Governors might also be empowered to accept the insurance of the whole fabric of the church on the application of the churchwardens and others.'

This proposal, explained and recommended as above, was formulated into a Bill and introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Egerton, that same year. The Bill was read a second time, was referred to a Select Committee, and amended by the Committee without limiting the principle upon which it was based. It was not, however, proceeded with further in the session of 1872.

In the year 1876, we find the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury again taking up the matter, and referring it to another and larger Committee. The Report of the Committee runs in the following words:—

'Whether the Church of England, by means of the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, should become its own fire insurance office, is another branch of the inquiry now before your Committee. In most of the replies made to their inquiries, this proposal was approved. Some, indeed, approved it subject to no fees being called into existence, but others gave it their unconditional support.'

The Committee proceed to recommend that another Bill should be introduced into Parliament, and the profits of fire insurance should be applied—

'in aid of the dilapidation account of the several benefices in proportion to the amount of the several premiums received from those benefices.'

Partly in consequence of this Report, but perhaps more in consequence of the deep dissatisfaction felt by the clergy with the operation of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, Mr. Goldney, in 1876, moved in the House of Commons for a Select Committee to inquire into the whole subject. In an exhaustive Report, the Committee give the weight of their authority in favour of a scheme which had occurred to more than one person, and which was powerfully supported by the

Bishop of Peterborough, which would include, in one annual payment either to a Diocesan Board, or to Queen Anne's Bounty Board, the charges for dilapidations and the premiums for insurance. By this simple method, one payment, annually made, would secure the incumbent from loss arising either by decay of time, or by accident, or by fire.

It was earnestly hoped that the session of 1877 would not have passed away without a Bill founded upon the report of Mr. Goldney's committee being introduced by the Government. Representations had been addressed to the Home Secretary, and the clergy anticipated relief. No Bill, however, was brought forward. In the meantime, the Dilapidations Act continued in operation, causing hardship in particular cases, and creating unnecessary expense in all cases. The unpopularity of the Act, to some degree, extended itself to the authorities into whose hands its execution was entrusted, that is to say, to the Bishops and to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty.

Queen Anne's Bounty Board is an institution, if not ancient, yet long established, and is one of those peculiar growths issuing from the connexion of the Church with the sovereign of these realms. Bishop Burnet, in his *History of His Own Times*, tells us how, 'in the year 1704, on her own birthday, which was the 6th of February, Queen Anne sent a message to the House of Commons, signifying her purpose to apply that part of her revenue that was raised out of first-fruits and tenths paid by the clergy to the increase of all the small benefices of the nation.' The revenue amounted to 15,000*l.* a year, and had never been applied to any good use. Indeed, in Charles II.'s time, the Bishop says it went chiefly among his women and natural children. When the Queen's message was brought into the House of Commons it was opposed by the Whigs and supported by the Tories. In the House of Lords the Bishops 'were zealous and unanimous for the Bill, so it was carried and passed into law.'

It was high time, indeed, that something should be done to improve the social and pecuniary condition of the clergy. We need not here describe, again, a state of things which underlay the vivacious pictures of Lord Macaulay and Mr. Lecky. But we may point out how both historians admit that, notwithstanding the hard lot of the rural clergy, their political influence was enormous. In writing of the general election of 1710, Mr. Lecky makes these remarks:—

'The immense power displayed by the Church in this struggle was not soon forgotten by statesmen. The utter ruin of a Ministry

supported by all the military achievements of Marlborough, and by all the financial skill of Godolphin, was beyond question mainly due to the exertions of the clergy. It furnished a striking proof that when fairly roused no other body in the country could command so large an amount of political enthusiasm, and it was also true that, except under very peculiar and abnormal circumstances, no other body had so firm and steady a hold on the affections of the people. Never was there a period less characterised by that intellectual torpor, which we are accustomed to associate with ecclesiastical domination, yet in very few periods of English history did the English Church manifest so great a power as in the reign of Queen Anne.

Such was the position and influence of the Church of England when the Bounty Board was established, just one hundred and seventy-two years ago. What is her present position and influence it is not the province of this article to describe, but we take notice that in the late session of Parliament a Bill was brought in by Mr. Bass and Mr. Monk for the total abolition of the Bounty Board and the transfer of its duties to others.

The Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty are nominated in the charter of their creation, and consist of the Archbishops, the Bishops, the Deans, the Lords-Lieutenant of counties, the Judges, the Queen's Counsels, the Serjeants-at-Law, the Chancellors and the Vice-Chancellors of the two Universities, the Mayors and Lord Mayors of cities, the Aldermen of the City of London, the officers of the Green Cloth, the whole of the Privy Council, and the Speaker of the House of Commons—in all about 600 persons. Their duties, which have in the course of years been largely extended, now consist in the collection of the revenue from first-fruits and tenths, its application to the augmentation of small livings, the control and investment of a constantly increasing capital, the lending of money to the clergy for building and kindred purposes. In recent times the augmentation grants have invariably been met by voluntary benefactions. For example, 200*l.* offered for the augmentation of a living by an individual benefactor, or through public subscription, is met by the Bounty Board by a grant of another 200*l.* The whole 400*l.* is then handed over to the Governors, invested by them, and the interest paid by them to the incumbent of the benefited living. From the year 1809 to the year 1820, an annual sum of 100,000*l.* was placed at the disposal of the Board by a Parliamentary vote; the revenue was appropriated to the augmentation of certain specified livings, the capital sum remaining in the hands of



the Board for investment. Thus has been accumulated in the course of years a capital which now amounts to between 3,000,000*l.* and 4,000,000*l.*, which is held by the Governors, and placed by them upon a great variety of securities. Interest at the rate of 3*l.* or 3½*l.* per cent. is paid to the incumbents of the augmented livings. It is computed that through this instrumentality the addition to incomes now being received by incumbents has reached an annual sum of 250,000*l.* and is increasing at the rate of about 1,000*l.* a year. The augmentation of income has been coupled with a corresponding addition to duties. New churches have been built, in consequence of a sufficient endowment having been provided for the performance of services, and the residence of the clergy has been secured by the erection of suitable parsonages. The capital in the meantime has been used to facilitate various ecclesiastical purposes, other than the augmentation of small livings, to the great benefit of the Church. Thus in 1777, under the provisions of Gilbert's Acts, the Governors were enabled to lend money at interest for the building of new and the improvement of old parsonages. Since that year about one million has been lent under that head alone. By virtue of similar Acts of Parliament, large sums have been lent for the building episcopal and capitular residences. In the year 1843, under an Act of Parliament, 600,000*l.* was lent by the Governors to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. This sum has lately been repaid, and again invested by the Board. The operations of the Board are now extended to such a degree that either as payers of augmentation grants, or as receivers of the interest of money lent for building purposes, they are in yearly correspondence with 10,000 beneficed clergymen. In the judgment of Mr. Bouverie's Select Committee, which sat in 1868, and took evidence in reference to this peculiar corporation, 'the business was carefully and well conducted,' and in their opinion 'neither economy nor convenience would be promoted by its amalgamation with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.' But a recommendation was added worthy, perhaps, of greater attention than it has ever received, either from the Church or from Parliament, to the effect that the Board should be rendered 'more conformable to the shape in which it actually works, by being reduced in number, the members having a more defined responsibility, and there being a considerable lay element in the new constitution.'

So in the course of years from its foundation to the present time, both by Acts of Parliament, and also by a series of orders under the sign manual, many changes have been

made affecting the modes of procedure and the application of the funds arising from the Royal bounty of Queen Anne. The scope of the Governors' work and the area of their responsibilities have been enlarged almost in proportion to the increase of their capital. At length, by the Dilapidations Act of 1871, the Board were made, for the purposes of that statute, the bankers of the clergy, and the recipients of all money paid under it. They were also, as we have stated above, made necessary parties to the insurance of all ecclesiastical buildings. In their capacity as bankers a sum of about 80,000*l.* is constantly lodged in their hands.

This sketch of the history and action of Queen Anne's Bounty Board will enable us the better to form a judgment on the part they have been called upon to play in the matter under consideration, and of the wisdom of the course which they themselves have adopted.

In the year 1872 Lord Egerton, one of the acting Governors of the Board, introduced, as we have seen, into the House of Lords a Bill for the Insurance of Ecclesiastical Buildings. In the succeeding year the Governors passed the following resolution :—

‘ Having considered the Report, they determine to wait for a time, but record their opinion that it strengthens the impression entertained by them that it is desirable in the interests of the Church that a measure on Fire Insurance similar to the Bill submitted to the House of Lords should become law.’

In the same year they passed the following resolution :—

‘ The Governors agreed that the Church of England Fire Insurance Bill should be introduced into the House of Commons ; Mr. Alderman Besley to act on behalf of the Board as to the measure during its progress through Parliament.’

On February 16, 1878, a similar Bill having been introduced into the House of Commons, they passed the following resolution :—

‘ That this Board approves the principle of the Bill introduced by Mr. Leighton for compulsory insurance with this Board of ecclesiastical buildings, and that a Committee be appointed to consider the details of the Bill when printed, and to suggest what is necessary to give effect to the provisions thereof.’

Before they had received the Report of their own Committee, and while the Select Committee of the House of Commons was still sitting, on May 13, 1878, they again met and passed the two following resolutions :—

'1st. That the Board is of opinion that it has no machinery suitable for giving effect to the provisions of the Bill in the way proposed.

'2nd. That no part of the funds at present administered by Queen Anne's Bounty Board ought to be applied in any way to the undertaking of insurance.'

It should be stated that the Board was composed of different individuals on each occasion when they considered the subject. They did not rescind their former resolution approving the principle of the Bill—on the contrary it remains a record of their opinion. The explanation suggested is that the first resolution represents the opinion of the Board on the principle, the two last on the details of the scheme. Perhaps, however, the publication of the above resolutions will make some think that the recommendation of Mr. Bouverie's Committee in 1868, with regard to the constitution of the Board, was not ill-timed.

At the beginning of the session of 1878 two Bills were introduced into the House of Commons, affecting very materially the position of the Bounty Board. The one was introduced by Mr. Bass and Mr. Monk, with the object of entirely extinguishing the Board and transferring their duties to the Ecclesiastical Commission. The other was the Bill of which we treat, which proposed to throw upon that body functions possibly exceeding in their pecuniary importance to the Church any which they have up to the present time performed.

It had long been observed that the Dilapidations Act, having introduced the principle that the clergy should be compelled by law to insure the buildings belonging to their benefices, had cast a new burden upon them. The continuous and inevitable decay from lapse of time was an expense which, in one form or another, had always belonged to them. The new Act, while it rendered this old charge more onerous, by creating an extremely expensive method of procedure, at the same time originated a new burden. So it resulted that the clergy were compelled to pay amongst themselves large sums under the head of 'Dilapidations,' and at the same time, under the head of 'Fire Insurance,' to pay to strangers, that is to say, to the shareholders of the private Insurance Offices, large sums to secure themselves against the very unlikely risk of fire. It was, however, perceived by some that the severity of the compulsory payments under the old denomination of 'Dilapidations' might be materially relieved if the clergy were enabled to keep amongst themselves the compulsory

payments under the new head of 'Insurance.' The main groundwork, therefore, of the Bill was to reserve to the clergy themselves the profits arising from their own premiums. The premiums themselves were to be reduced from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 1*s.* per cent. for ordinary first-class risks. The insurance policy was to be perpetual, and instead of lapsing every year was to remain in force without renewal, as a charge upon the incumbent for the time being. By this means it was intended to free the incumbent from the danger of losing the advantage of his insurance in case of a fire breaking out when his premium was in arrear. The tiresome obligation of exhibiting the receipt of the last year's policy at the Archidiaconal visitation was dispensed with; the profits were to be retained for the benefit of the Church. But together with these advantages, the original Bill contained a clause that the business was to be conducted by the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, that is to say, by a body of 600 persons. The compulsion to insure with them was to extend without exemption to all the buildings which came within the scope of the Dilapidations Act, but it was left to the Governors to decide the class under which the insurance was to be effected, that is to say, whether the premium was to be 1*s.*, or 1*s.* 6*d.*, or 2*s.*, or more. The authority given to the surveyors was almost unlimited, and seemed to exclude appeal. It was not evident on the face of the Bill how the profits were to be applied. There was no arbitration clause, nor were the conditions of the insurance to be found in the schedule of the Bill. Moreover, the Governors had power to give up the business after a year's notice. It will be seen how fully these objections were maintained, and the alterations in the Bill when it emerged from the Select Committee show how fully the force of some of them was appreciated.

The Bill came on for its second reading early in the session of 1878. The debate proved that although the House of Commons were willing to consider any Bill of such a character which was proposed in the interests of the clergy, yet that upon the merits of this particular Bill they were profoundly ignorant. When members were told on one side that the clergy approved, that Queen Anne's Bounty Board approved, that the House of Lords had approved a similar Bill six years before, that a Select Committee of their own House had approved the principle, that the Lower House of Convocation had approved, that the parochial clergy had been consulted through the Rural Deaneries, and that no less than 140 Rural Deans had signified approval, they were inclined

to read the Bill a second time. But when they heard almost every one of these statements questioned, if not flatly contradicted, and when, moreover, it was urged that to sanction the Bill would be to create 'a system of gigantic monopoly,' that it would be 'a breach of trust to allow the funds of Queen Anne's Bounty to be used in a method not contemplated by its founder,' that 'the scheme was quite certain to end in ruin, and was a mere speculation,'—when they heard all these things asserted in opposition to the Bill, and when, moreover, the Bill was not brought forward by the Government, but by a private member, it was only natural that the House should readily accept the middle course, which relieves it from all responsibility; and so the Bill was referred to a Select Committee.

The Committee in the present instance consisted of the following seventeen members:—Earl Percy (chairman), Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Monk, Mr. Birley, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Bristowe, Mr. Hardcastle, Sir Thomas Acland, Mr. Cotton, Sir Sidney Waterlow, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Wait, Mr. Mc Lagan, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, and Mr. Hall. The last two were unable to attend.

In comparing the names on the Committee with the published lists of Directors of Insurance Offices, we find that at least six were Directors of Fire Insurance Offices.

It was necessary for the promoters of the Bill, if they were to carry its principle, to show generally—

1st. That the clergy desired the Bill.

2nd. That the scheme was financially sound.

3rd. That it was possible to give to Queen Anne's Bounty Board a machinery equal to the work.

The exact contrary of each of these propositions was maintained by the opponents of the Bill; and so battle was joined. We will now discuss the arguments submitted to the Committee under separate heads, not in our own words, but in the words of the witnesses themselves, whose character and position we will first describe.

The clerical witnesses were the Rev. Michael Gibbs, Vicar of Christchurch, Newgate Street, London, Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of London, Prebendary and Treasurer of St. Paul's Cathedral, Chairman of the Committee of Convocation for the amendment of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act; the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chichester; the Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton, Rector of Castle Ashby, and Archdeacon of Oakham; the Rev. H. A. Jeffreys, Hon. Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, Vicar of Hawkhurst, Rural Dean,

member of Convocation; the Rev. George Trevor, Canon of York Cathedral, Rector of Beeford.

The actuarial evidence was given by—Mr. Cornelius Walford, Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries, Chairman of the Colonial Life Insurance Company, standing counsel to several Insurance Companies, author of the *Insurance Cyclopædia*; Mr. Plummer, the Manager of the Wesleyan Methodist Trust Assurance Company; Mr. Dudgeon, the Manager of the County Fire Office in Ireland, which takes the Insurances of the Irish Church property; Mr. Ansell, an actuary; Mr. Tomkinson, Chairman of the Committee of the Associated Fire Insurance Companies; Mr. Aston, Treasurer and Secretary of Queen Anne's Bounty Board.

In taking evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons the Chairman examines the witness in chief in the first place, and after the conclusion of his examination, every member of the Committee is invited to put any question he likes to the witness. The intention of the Committee is first of all to call before them the persons most conversant with the subject who are willing to give evidence, and then to obtain from them all that can be said for and against the scheme submitted to them. For the sake of brevity and clearness, we have divided the evidence under certain distinct heads, giving in the words of the several witnesses themselves their opinions. We have in some instances inserted the question as well as the answer, in order the more exactly to show the drift of the argument.

On the question of the opinion of the clergy in reference to the Bill, the Rev. Michael Gibbs said :—

‘The subject of Ecclesiastical Fire Insurance has been under the consideration of Convocation, and their opinion is that Parliament should take it in hand. The action of Convocation in the matter during the last six years has been to appoint two Committees to report on the question.’

The Report of these two Committees upon which the Bill is based have been referred to at length in an earlier part of this article; we therefore omit them here.

‘As far as I have collected, there is a very large preponderance of clerical feeling in favour of the Bill, there are not half a dozen cases in my knowledge in which the feeling is doubtful. I have seen answers from 150 Rural Deans, not one of which is entirely adverse, but three or four object to the compulsory part of the Bill. It appears, from the circulars which have been sent out to the Rural Deans, that the parochial clergy all over England and Wales have been consulted through the Rural Deaneries. Broadly, I consider



that the rural clergy are in favour of the principle of compulsion as defined by the Bill, because the whole thing turns upon that point.'

The Rev. Canon Trevor, a determined opponent of the Bill, gave, on the same point, evidence of an exactly contradictory character. He said :—

'I have had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the opinions of a number of the clergy in different parts of England. Our Rural Deanery consists of twenty-five clergy, of whom seventeen or eighteen were present at our Deanery meeting, and we were unanimous against the Bill.

'*The Chairman.*—Can you give the Committee any idea of the number of persons amongst the clergy who have expressed their disapproval of this Bill?

'*Canon Trevor.*—No. There has been no opportunity afforded of seeing the Bill.

'*Sir Thomas Acland.*—I have not gathered from your evidence that any very large number of clergy have signified their opposition to the Bill?

'*Canon Trevor.*—Not to me; but there are petitions against it, and several letters have appeared in the *Guardian* against the Bill from other clergymen.'

In answer to other questions, it appeared that Canon Trevor had himself written letters against the Bill, which appeared in the *Guardian*, the *John Bull*, and the *Morning Post*.

'*The Chairman.*—I understand you to say that this Bill originated with some dignitaries in the Southern Province, and to a certain extent that it was the child of Queen Anne's Bounty Board?

'*Canon Trevor.*—It was.

'*The Chairman.*—Will you state to the Committee what the grounds for those opinions are?

'*Canon Trevor.*—My grounds are, that a circular was sent to all the Rural Deans; it does not bear the name of the Bounty Board, but by the shape, and the appearance, and the style of it, it appears to come from the Bounty Office. I do not know who else would have money to pay for it; and it bears the names of two or three dignitaries of the Southern Province, from which, I suppose, they are the parents of the Bill. They recommend the measure, but they do not send a copy of the Bill with the circular.'

On this point the Canon was further pressed by Sir Thomas Acland and Mr. Bristowe, the latter of whom is an acting member of Queen Anne's Bounty Board.

'*Sir Thomas Acland.*—Upon what grounds do you state that the circular came from the Bounty Board Office?

'*Canon Trevor.*—That it was printed on a large paper in a

luxurious sort of way ; that some office must have printed it ; and I could not think that any other office would have done it.

'*Sir Thomas Acland.*—If you had been told that an individual member of this Committee had sent them round himself, and had paid for them himself, would you consider that luxurious evidence conclusive proof?

'*Canon Trevor.*—It might have come from the House of Commons certainly.

'*Mr. Bristowe.*—You are still under the impression, apparently, that the Bounty Board are concerned in bringing this Bill forward?

'*Canon Trevor.*—I do not know whether they are or not. I judge from reading the Bill, that it is promoted by the Bounty Board. I do not know who else could promote the Bill.

'*Mr. Bristowe.*—Is it not rather a strong statement on your part, judging from the Bill itself, to say positively that it is an emanation from Queen Anne's Bounty Board?

'*Canon Trevor.*—No, I did not say so. I have no means of judging that.

'*The Chairman.*—Will you kindly tell the Committee what the chief points are to which the clergy take exception in this Bill?

'*Canon Trevor.*—We take exception to the compulsory character of it. In the first instance we say that it is a violent invasion of vested rights, a thing which Parliament never sanctioned at any time whatever.

'*Mr. Hardcastle.*—When you use the expression, "injustice of the Bill," do you consider that the compulsion to insure is an injustice?

'*Canon Trevor.*—I said not ; I said it was a strong measure. It is a violation of the ordinary rights of men ; but I think, under the circumstances, it might be justifiable.

'*Mr. Hardcastle.*—Then an existing Act of Parliament having compelled the clergy to insure, you think it is an injustice to compel them for their mutual benefit to insure in a cheaper way than they could otherwise have done?

'*Canon Trevor.*—Yes, I do think that an injustice. If the clergy do not think it is for their mutual benefit, and if they do not think it will be cheap, I think it unjust to make them insure in any particular scheme.

'*Mr. Rodwell.*—If the theory of this Bill were carried into practice, namely, a reduction of premiums from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 1*s.* per cent., you would not deny that that would be a benefit to the poorer clergy?

'*Canon Trevor.*—*Ceteris paribus*, that would be a benefit to them.

'*Mr. Rodwell.*—*Ceteris paribus*, I assume. Supposing you give the clergy the facility of insuring at 1*s.*, what they now have to pay 1*s.* 6*d.* for, is not that an unquestionable benefit to them?

'*Canon Trevor.*—Yes ; that speaks for itself.'

Canon Trevor pressed this point, and in answer to another question said :—

‘If all the clergy in the kingdom petition for it, they have no right to take my money to make their insurances cheaper.’

The Canon also stated :—

‘I maintain that the clergy, who are the parties interested, have not been consulted. They were not consulted on the Bill, but upon a paper which I call delusive.’

On this point he was at issue with the Rev. Canon Jeffreys, who stated, in answer to questions from Mr. Stanley Leighton :—

‘As Rural Dean an offer was made to forward me a copy of the Bill, by the member who has charge of it. I am sure all the Rural Deans were treated in the same way, and that they have been consulted. I am not aware of any readier method of consulting the parochial clergy than through the Rural Deaneries.’

We proceed now with the clerical evidence.

The *Bishop of Chichester* said : ‘My opinion is that the clergy should be allowed the advantage of mutual assurance ; that they constitute a body large in extent, and a great number of whom have houses which they are compelled to keep in repair, and to reinstate if they are destroyed by fire ; that there is an Act already, compelling them to insure ; and that, therefore, it is only fair to them that they should insure to the greatest possible advantage. I think all compulsion is regarded as a hardship ; it is impossible to devise such a means of doing anything as will not offend some one particular man. The English mind revolts against compulsion ; but, at the same time, it is sometimes desirable to compel men to their own good ; and in this case the good to be obtained is so considerable, that I think the experience of a few years would probably overcome the repugnance to compulsion, which, I am ready to admit, exists here and there, and may probably exist extensively. The justification of the present Bill is that many of the clergy desire a system of mutual insurance to be established for their advantage, under the authority of Parliament. The success of such a scheme depends upon compulsion, in order to secure certainty and uniformity of application.’

The Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton came to state what passed in Convocation when the Bill was discussed there. He said that the actual vote was taken on the compulsory clause, but that the Bill was debated throughout. The numbers in favour of the Bill were 47 and against the Bill 8. He considered that Convocation in this matter fairly represented the feelings of the clergy.

On the vote of Convocation, Canon Jeffreys gave somewhat similar evidence.

‘*Canon Jeffreys.*—I wish to state that the votes in Convocation

are determined by the Proctors for the Dioceses almost invariably, because of the Deans and of those who hold official position, a great many never attend by any chance, and others very seldom attend. The Archdeacons may be regarded as officials, but a great many of them are parochial clergy, and in this vote I believe that we entirely represented the parochial clergy.'

The necessity for the compulsory clause from an actuarial point of view was given by Mr. Cornelius Walford :—

'I consider the compulsory clause necessary for the financial success of the scheme, for this reason, that you must get the business without the expense of canvassing for it. You could not conduct a class business, that is to say, a limited business in itself, at the rates proposed in the schedule, in my judgment, unless the business came to you without searching for it, that is to say, without the paid agency necessary to bring it. I think if the State compels the clergy to insure, the clergy are right in endeavouring to devise a scheme by which they can insure at the smallest cost.'

We now come to another department of the evidence, namely the actuarial, which includes the questions of the financial soundness of the scheme, the possibility of the shilling premium and the principle of what was termed the creation of a monopoly.

Mr. Tomkinson, the chairman of the committee of the Insurance Offices, and formerly the principal officer of the Sun Fire Office, described the position taken up by the Fire Offices with regard to the Bill. The committee of which he was chairman, he said, consisted of representatives of rather more than fifty Companies, which co-operated in certain matters of rates for classes of risks (not all risks), and generally on other matters which were deemed to be of common interest to the Fire Insurance profession. They were the 'Tariff' Companies. He should think altogether there would be a large amount of business in their associated offices affected by the Bill; all the business affected by the Bill would probably be removed from existing offices.

Mr. Cornelius Walford explained that the 'Tariff' Offices are an association of Fire Assurance Offices, which agree not to insure risks of a certain defined class for less than a minimum defined premium. The 'non-Tariff' Offices are simply those which are not bound by any such regulations. Nine out of ten of the Insurance Offices are Tariff Offices. It is unquestionably a commercial trade combination. The charge of monopoly has frequently been brought against Insurance Offices.

'*Mr. Tomkinson.*—Speaking from a Fire Insurance point of view,

I would submit that the Fire Insurance Offices object to the Bill as creating a monopoly in that portion of the Bill which is proposed to be compulsory, and then on the basis of the business so created to transact general competitive business; the second class of business being brought in to support the monopoly business. There are two classes of business, the one monopoly, the other competitive, and while the two together form a mass of business which Fire Insurance experience regards as being of too small an area to be prudently conducted, either of the two would alone, *à fortiori*, be a very hazardous business to undertake, owing partly to the limited area, and, secondly, to the question of expenses, which bear a large proportion to a small business.

*The Chairman.*—Are you aware of how many risks are likely to be available under the compulsory clause?

*Mr. Tomkinson.*—Not at all. I have no means of judging.

*The Chairman.*—I understand you to be distinctly of opinion that the rate of premium of 1*s.* per cent. on first-class risks under this Bill is insufficient?

*Mr. Tomkinson.*—I should certainly feel very great doubt about it, even if the whole business contemplated by the Bill were brought within their scope.

*The Chairman.*—At the same time, as you have no knowledge of the details of the business which would come under the control of the Bounty Board, your opinion is rather a general one, from a general knowledge of the nature of Insurance business, than one formed upon any figures upon which you have based your calculations.

*Mr. Tomkinson.*—Certainly. I have no means of taking actual figures.

Mr. Aston, the Secretary of the Bounty Board, said :—

‘One Fire Insurance Office has already made an overture to take the business contemplated in this Bill at 1*s.* per cent., and another at 1*s.* 1*d.* per cent. Those offices have been charging the clergy hitherto 1*s.* 6*d.* per cent. on ordinary risks, and 2*s.* and 2*s.* 6*d.* on other risks.’

Mr. Dudgeon, the Agent of the County Fire Office, said :—

‘Every church and every glebe house vested in the Church body of Ireland is insured in one lump in the County Fire Office. The rate of premium is 1*s.* 6*d.*, reduced by returns to an annual premium of only 1*s.* per cent. The annual premiums amount to 1,000*l.*, the annual losses to 20*l.* I do not at all dispute the possibility of the insurance being done at 1*s.* per cent., because I propose to do it myself.’

Mr. Plummer, the Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Insurance Company, gave evidence with regard to the experience of that Society :—

‘The Wesleyan Methodist Trust Assurance Company insures the chapels, schools, and ministers’ houses of the Wesleyan connexion,

together with the furniture in the ministers' houses. We take no other business. The office has been in existence six years. The premiums have paid all the losses and all the expenses, and we have accumulated a fund of 7,000*l.* As far as we can ascertain we can make now an average annual profit of 2,000*l.* We deal with the surplus in the interests of the Connexion. We have at present 4,500 distinct properties insured with us. We do not retain more than 3,000*l.* on any individual risk. About 30 per cent. of our policies exceed 2,000*l.* I should think. Our experience goes to prove that we have an abundantly large enough area to work upon. Our losses during five years have been 20*l.* per cent. of the premiums. The risks are first-class risks, from an Insurance point of view ; there may be exceptions among them, but taking them all round, they are first-class.

*Mr. Cornelius Walford.*—Supposing the Bill to pass and the insurance of these houses were compulsory, and supposing also that the basis upon which the calculation was made were a satisfactory one, there would be no risk whatever in Queen Anne's Bounty Board advancing money for first losses, supposing that such advances depended for being recouped upon the accumulation of premiums. I do not think, if the scheme be well worked, that Queen Anne's Bounty Board will run any risk in standing godfather to the system. I am of opinion that in three years the fund accumulated would be sufficient to meet all engagements arising upon it. It is a perfectly safe investment for the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty Board to invest their money in at a fair percentage. Assuming the business is conducted with skill there may be said to be no risk. Taken as a whole, there is no class of property which is considered a better class risk than parsonage houses. They are special in their goodness, as others are special in their badness. I believe that 1 per cent. premium is abundantly sufficient, if care is taken in the acceptance of first-class risks. The County Office (which insures the Irish Church at 1*s.* per cent. premium) is of the first order. I am sure they would not take the parsonages at any rate, whatever it might be, unless they saw their way to make a profit out of the transaction. In the case proposed by the Bill the cost of management would be exceptionally small, because the cost of management in the ordinary way includes advertising to get business and agents' commission. Here there would be no advertising and no agents, so that there would be no 1*5l.* per cent. or 12½ per cent. for agents' commission. Therefore, at least, half the expenses would be saved to start with. Again, the fact of not issuing policies and the diminished postage would lessen the cost to a considerable degree. There is at present a highly respectable office which is taking first-class risks at 1*s.* per cent. ; that office is the National in Bridge Street, Blackfriars. The Wesleyan Methodist Trust Assurance I consider most distinctly to be financially sound. Supposing out of 10,000 parsonages 8,000 were under 1,000*l.* in value, 1,000 under 2,000*l.* in value, and 1,000 under 3,000*l.* in value, I should consider the conditions of the business very good and certain.



On this portion of the subject the clerical evidence is not of course so valuable as the actuarial ; it will, however, be interesting to read the following :—

Canon Trevor thought that the ecclesiastical risk was not less than the average risk.

The Bishop of Chichester stated that there had been only one fire in the seven years of his episcopate in the 264 parsonages of his diocese ; and that the late Bishop of Lichfield had told him that there had not been a single fire in his diocese during the whole ten years of his episcopate.

On the part the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty were called upon to play in carrying out the scheme, and the user of their funds, Canon Trevor objected to the employment of the funds in the way indicated by the Bill, and maintained further that even the present power to borrow from Queen Anne's Bounty for the purposes of building was a perversion of the bounty funds.

'*Mr. Rodwell.*—You think there has been a legal misappropriation, so to speak, of the funds of the Bounty Board ever since they were diverted from their original purpose of augmenting small livings ?

'*Canon Trevor.*—It was an innovation, and one which was open to considerable exception ; so much so, that the Secretary of the Board said they wanted a bill of indemnity.

'*Mr. Rodwell.*—Has that innovation been attended with very great advantage to a great many clergy in building their new parsonages ?

'*Canon Trevor.*—Certainly. I said so.

'*Mr. Birley.*—I want to know how the poorer clergy are prejudiced if the money which is to augment their livings is received in the way of interest upon loans to the beneficed clergy ; if they are getting 3 per cent. from these loans, how much more would they get if the money were invested in consols ?

'*Canon Trevor.*—Nothing more in that way ; but if the money were invested in land it would produce a great deal more.'

On the same subject Mr. Gibbs and the Bishop of Chichester took quite another view.

'*Mr. Gibbs.*—Recognising that the whole object of Queen Anne's Bounty is the relief of small livings, I think that the application of their funds in the direction of a cheap insurance would be for the benefit of the incumbents of small livings, and, therefore, in accordance with the spirit of the original constitution. It is certainly a benefit to them to insure their houses at a low rate, and it is a very good appropriation of the money in the hands of the Governors, provided no loss were ultimately sustained. I do not see that the Bill will convert Queen Anne's Bounty Board into a trading company, or that the insurance of parsonages is a speculative business.

'*The Bishop of Chichester.*—I think the value of the saving would be greater to the incumbents of small livings, and that, in that case, it is quite a benevolent application of the Bounty fund, and that it would be so far carrying out the objects of the Bounty Board.'

Among the minor points which excited attention and caused much misapprehension, was the exclusion of the Bishops' palaces from the compulsory operation of the Bill.

'*Canon Trevor.*—Another thing which the clergy feel very strongly is, that this Bill exempts the bishops. We resent that very much; if it is good for us, it is good for the bishops; if it is good for the bishops to exercise an independent judgment, it is good for us to exercise it upon our individual property.

'*The Chairman.*—Have you at all thought whether the value of the bishops' palaces has not influenced the framers of this measure to exclude them from the operation of this Bill; I mean in this way, that the greater the value of the risks insured, supposing they are few in number, the more uncertain is the scheme for both?

'*Canon Trevor.*—No. I had not thought of that. I did not know that there was any other reason for it, except that the bishops, being in Parliament, would probably have obstructed the Bill, if it had been compulsory upon them.

'*Mr. Stanley Leighton.*—But if you had been told that the reason for their omission was not clerical but was commercial, and that the value of the bishops' palaces was so much larger than that of the ordinary parsonages that, if included in the compulsory part of the Bill, they would have upset the averages; that would remove your objection, would it not?

'*Canon Trevor.*—If I were told so by a competent actuary, but not if I were told so by two or three dignitaries who had been told something by somebody else which they cannot prove.

'*Mr. Tomkinson.*—There is a commercial reason for excluding bishops' palaces from the compulsory operation of the Bill. It certainly would not be safe to take twenty-five risks of 10,000*l.* in value each.

'*Mr. Cornelius Walford.*—Any business based upon risks ranging, say, from 400*l.* to 800*l.*, is a perfectly safe business; if you have a thousand risks of that sort your business will be perfectly safe; but if you have amongst those risks a smaller number of risks of a very much higher amount in value, you will have no average of your larger risks; you will have an average of the small risks; they make their own average by their numbers; but the average of the larger risks does not arise; you must have, in order to make an average, say, at least, a thousand risks; that is to say, if you take the 5,000*l.* line, you should have a thousand risks of 5,000*l.* to make an average. It will be seen that just in proportion as the sum is large which may be lost in one risk, you must have a corresponding number of the same risk to produce the average in that class.'

We next refer to the objections with regard to the details,

upon which there appears to be much unanimity of opinion amongst the witnesses; and the suggestions made were, for the most part, incorporated into the amended Bill. These refer principally to the survey, the directorate, the power of giving up the business, the power of appeal in cases of dispute.

Mr. Gibbs, the Bishop of Chichester, Lord Alwyne Compton, and Canon Trevor, were unanimous in objecting to the necessity of surveying all the parsonages, to the placing the directorate in the hands of the whole body of the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, to the absence of an appeal or arbitration clause; it was also suggested that the parties affected by the Bill should have representation on the directorate.

*Mr. Plummer*, Secretary of the Wesleyan Assurance Society.—We do not survey the buildings. It would never pay to do so. We send a schedule to be filled up with certain questions. Our staff is very small indeed. It consists of myself and two clerks. In case of losses we employ individuals not on our permanent staff. In case of a small loss, we should simply tell the individual to send an estimate of the cost of restoring the damage, and if we were satisfied that the estimate were a reasonable one, we should remit the money. Our Directors are not paid; we find no difficulty in obtaining the attendance of unpaid Directors. I think you have intrusted in the Bill far too much power to your surveyor. I would give a right of appeal against his decision, decidedly. I think the discretion which is given to incumbents in case of special risks to insure elsewhere, should be extended to risks in the second class, and to the farming and doubly hazardous class. In cases of differences with our Company, the matter is decided by arbitration. If such a power were introduced in the Bill it would meet the objection with regard to disputes between the insurers and the Company.

*Mr. Cornelius Walford*.—With regard to parsonages, the vast majority of them being first-class risks, inspection would certainly not be necessary in most cases.

On the conclusion of the evidence, the Committee passed the following five resolutions:—

‘1. That it is desirable that incumbents of ecclesiastical benefices in England and Wales should become their own insurers against loss by fire, through a system of insurance managed by some public authority.

‘2. That when such system shall have been established, it shall be compulsory on the incumbents to insure, through such a system, all buildings comprised in the first class in the schedule of this Bill, provided the risk on any one building shall not exceed 2,500*l*.

‘3. That the machinery at the disposal of Queen Anne's Bounty Board is not at present adequate for the purposes of the Bill, but may

be made competent by the appointment of a committee of management authorised to employ a suitable and efficient staff.

'4. That no part of the funds at present administered by Queen Anne's Bounty Board, ought to be applied, by loan or otherwise, to the undertaking of insurance, without the consent of the Board, subject to the sanction of the Lords of the Treasury.

'5. That upon the evidence submitted to them, your Committee have no reason to doubt but that the scheme of insurance proposed by the Bill is based upon sound financial principles.'

The resolutions do not seem to have been passed without frequent divisions. Mr. Cotton, a Director of the London, Liverpool, and Globe Fire Office; Mr. Freshfield, Director of the Law Fire Office; and Mr. McLagan, Director of the Queen Fire Office, supported by Mr. Monk, Mr. Bristowe, and Mr. Rowley Hill, opposed the resolutions. Mr. Monk and Mr. Freshfield both proposed contrary resolutions, which were lost.

The Bill was then reconstructed on the new lines marked out by the resolutions and suggested by the evidence. Very large alterations were made, which we will summarise under the following heads:—

1. A permanent Directorate of twelve persons, three of whom were to be incumbents under the Act, was substituted for the Directorate of the general body of Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty.

2. The compulsory operation of the Bill was limited to those cases only in which the Directors could offer to the clergy cheaper terms of insurance than could be procured from the Insurance Offices.

3. The safety of the financial arrangements was secured by the exemption of large risks, *i.e.*, those above 2,500*l.*, from the compulsory clause.

4. The Directors were empowered to borrow money on the security of the future premiums, either from the Bounty Board, with the consent of the Governors and the sanction of the Treasury, or in the public market.

5. All the clauses referring to the surveyors were struck out. The statement of the incumbent was to be considered *prima facie* evidence of the value and condition of his premises, and a liberal arbitration clause for all disputed cases was inserted.

6. In case of fire, payment of the amount due under the insurance was to be made, as might be required, during, instead of after, the rebuilding.

7. The disposal of the profits, after a due reserve fund

had been accumulated, towards the reduction of the premiums, was made obligatory.

8. The conditions of the insurance, which correspond to the policy in ordinary cases, were inserted in a schedule to the Bill, in which losses occasioned by lightning were included.

The immediate reduction of the premium on first-class risks from 1*s.* 6*d.* to 1*s.* per cent. remained as originally proposed.

Such are the leading provisions of the Bill, as it now stands. It is clearly one which requires an almost unanimous expression of clerical opinion in its favour before it can receive the approbation of Parliament. The pecuniary interests of powerful Companies are touched. The number of Directors of Fire Insurance Companies in the House of Commons is about forty. Many of them are gentlemen of the most influential position. It would be quite unreasonable to expect them to be consenting parties to such a blow to the special interests which it is one of their duties to protect, unless they were made quite sure that those in whose behalf the legislation was promoted were united in desiring it.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact opinion of 15,000 clergymen, scattered over the length and breadth of England and Wales. The usual channels through which the voice of the clergy is expressed are Convocation, diocesan and archidiaconal meetings, Church conferences and congresses. Some of these have passed resolutions in favour of the principle of the scheme, some have not discussed it, and not one, we believe, has opposed it. By petitions to Parliament the wishes of the clergy are also directly recorded. One hundred and fifty-four petitions were last year presented in favour of the Bill we are considering, and six petitions were presented against it.

Some idea may be formed of the area of the possible operations of the proposed scheme under the optional, as well as the compulsory clauses, and of its possible future, from the following figures, which we believe approximate to the truth :—

11,000 parsonages—annual premiums . . .	8,000 <sup>6</sup>
8,000 farmhouses and buildings other than parsonages on glebe lands . . . . .	2,500
5,000 chancels which the clerical Rectors are bound to keep insured . . . . .	2,500
Palaces and Capitular buildings . . . . .	500
Furniture . . . . .	1,000
Churches and Cathedrals . . . . .	50,000

---

£64,500

## SHORT NOTICES.

*The Annotated Bible: being a Household Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, comprehending the Results of Modern Discovery and Criticism.* By the Rev. J. H. BLUNT, M.A. Vol. I. Genesis to Esther, with the General Introduction. (London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1878.)

ANNOTATED editions of the Holy Scriptures are neither few nor infrequent. We can call to mind three, if not four such, each of some mark, which are in course of publication at the present time. It is a very hopeful sign that this should be so, and that each of these appeals to the care for and attachment to the Holy Scriptures should meet with, as far as appears, a considerable amount of public support.

The work before us has, we think, features which distinguish it from previous editions of the Holy Scriptures. The editor, Mr. J. H. Blunt, is widely and favourably known by his *Annotated Prayer-Book*, *Dictionary of Theology*, and many other undertakings. The present work shows quite as conspicuously as its predecessors the qualities of sound judgment and unwearied industry, and will be not less valued, we should think, than they. This first volume contains the books up to Esther, with Introductions to each; and a General Introduction to the whole is prefixed, which is admirably calculated to supply necessary preliminary knowledge to a student of the Scriptures who is intelligent and fairly educated, but not versed in the history and antiquities of the Bible as a *book among books*. Indeed, we do not know any one publication in which the great mass of facts relating to the language, the transcription, the versions, and the extant copies of the Bible is contained in a form at once so comprehensive, so brief and succinct, and so pleasant to peruse. The fifth chapter, 'On the Liturgical Use of Holy Scripture,' is highly interesting. Chapter IV. 'On the Interpretation of Scripture,' is confined perhaps too exclusively to the use of secondary helps, such as arise from study and learning, to the understanding of the Scriptures; and it might have been well to deal expressly with the function of Ecclesiastical Tradition *eo nomine*. We think we see in the editor a tendency, which should be carefully guarded, to dwell on the unity of the Bible almost as if it was a single book, and without sufficient regard to the strong and remarkable diversities of language and thought which the various books present. The peculiar ἥθος of Genesis or Exodus differs widely from that of the Books of Kings, and both of them differ again from that of Job or Ecclesiastes. Neither the literary style, nor the details of national institutions, nor the currents of thought which underlie the narrative, and form its background, are identical even in any two of the historical books. If we grind the history down to a tame uniformity, we destroy its verisimilitude, or rather we have not entered into its inner meaning at all. The Bible



is never really understood unless (1) it is considered as a collection of ancient records, which show the progress of a nation from infancy to maturity and culture; and (2) unless the unity looked for, beyond, of course, its historical consistency, is in the *divine purpose* that guided and watched over the process.

The execution of the work seems to us unequal. Nothing could be better done than this Introduction, as a whole; but those to the several books seem to us brief and jejune. The annotation all through is just what it should be, brief, suggestive, and clear. Mr. Blunt might sometimes, we think, have made more use of *natural* analogies to the supernatural events of the narrative, as *e.g.* in the plagues of Egypt. The two forms of the Decalogue are apparently not compared (Exod. xx.) The note on xix. 22 states that the priests there spoken of must have been the heads of houses or 'patriarchal priesthood,' because the Levitical priesthood was not yet instituted. It would have been well to insert here or elsewhere an *excursus* on this earlier priesthood. The note on the Rock of Horeb (xvii. 6) is good, and gives a probable solution of a long-standing difficulty.

It is a merit not to be overlooked in these notes, that the devotional or homiletic element is not neglected in them. Care is generally taken to point out the mystical or typical import of the passage under consideration, and the use that has been made of it by the Fathers. At the same time this is only done to a certain extent; the commentary might be greatly developed by any one who would collate (say) the Homilies of S. Augustine or S. Chrysostom for this purpose. Mr. Blunt has, however, given his readers a glimpse of Patristic interpretation, which will be to their profit. We regard his work, as far as it has yet gone, with great satisfaction. It is not intended for scholars. But the intelligent and able notes will be to many persons a new light upon the pages of the older Scriptures; not unfrequently a help to clear up difficulties of interpretation, such as a school of critics in the present day delights to raise, and which seem to strike and fester sometimes in minds one might suppose the farthest removed from such dangers, and they will be found to tend *always* to help and to strengthen faith, never to weaken or diminish it.

*The Englishman's Critical and Expository Bible Cyclopedia.* Compiled and written by the Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, M.A., Rector of S. Cuthbert's, York. Illustrated by six hundred woodcuts. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

THE volume before us consists of seven hundred and fifty-three large octavo pages, of clear but small type, three columns to the page, and the remarkable industry of the writer strikes us with sheer amazement. No doubt much of the work had been done to his hand. He has not, however, contented himself with a mere redaction of previous researches, and the articles are, as a rule, marked by the individuality of the writer. Indeed, this characteristic of the work runs into an undesirable narrowness of view. This is not so apparent in the

articles on separate books of Holy Scripture, in which the author has been generally successful in retaining orthodox views, without neglecting the conclusions of modern critical science. It must probably be attributed to the design of the work that the Hebrew and Greek words are written throughout in English characters, and that, as a rule, critical conclusions, as, *e.g.* to authenticity and authorship of the various books, are simply stated, and little or no explanation given of the arguments by which these are arrived at and supported. Generally speaking, however, this class of articles are done very satisfactorily according to their proposed scale, and with praiseworthy care and accuracy.

The compiler, however, has chosen to combine with the Bible Dictionary a theological and doctrinal one, and, looking at the book in this light, we can by no means report so favourably of it. Under the head of doctrine we get too often the crude and one-sided utterances which form the shibboleths of a party, without even the pretence of impartiality; and, as might be expected, these articles, in too many instances, bear inadequacy on their face. Thus, for instance, the 'Power of the Keys' is referred to only casually under 'Key,' and we are then told that 'it was given to Peter and the other Apostles, only at times, when and in so far as Christ made him and them infallible'—a statement which appears to us either ludicrous or unintelligible. Under 'Priest' occurs a good summary of Old Testament facts; but this is preceded by a marvellous tissue of assertions, beginning with the bald *dictum* that 'the notion is contrary to Scripture, that Christ is High Priest, and Christian ministers priests;' and to pass over a number of similar statements, ending with the no less remarkable conclusion that, 'as sacrificing was the Temple priest's duty, so Gospel preaching is the Christian minister's duty.' For 'Sacrament' we look altogether in vain. While he treats of the succession of the Scribes, he leaves out Apostolical Succession altogether. 'Lord's Supper' is not so violent as we might have expected, but the author fights the air and combats an imaginary doctrine, that the Lord's Supper is not a repetition of the sacrifice on Calvary—a theory which never has been upheld by any party in the Church. The article on 'Creation' is excellent, and the geographical articles generally have profited by the latest researches. The biographical element is also adequate; the narratives are clear and definite, and embody a vast number of well-chosen and skilfully arranged facts. The numerous woodcuts are very helpful to the understanding of the text, though the beauty of the details is much affected by their small size. Upon the whole, this work is so generally painstaking, and so good in many respects, that we must strongly regret that it has not been confined to the function of a Bible dictionary, and left theology alone. The one is discharged on the whole very well; the other (although there are good articles on 'Atonement,' 'High Priest,' and Law) as ill as possible. The book is worth having as a very good, though condensed, Bible dictionary; though less really valuable to Churchmen than its size and fulness, and the care, industry, and learning which have been spent on its composi-

tion, would have made it, with a little more breadth of view and less of dogmatism.

*The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation, and with Various Readings and Critical Notes.*

Small 4to, pp. vi.—1134. (London: S. Bagster and Sons, 1879.)

THIS handsome book is beautifully printed in small, but very clear Greek and English types, in double columns, but, owing to the unfortunately narrow rule adopted by Messrs. Bagster in all their Biblical publications, it does not contain the whole LXX., since the Deuterocanonical books belonging to the Egypto-Hebrew Canon are omitted—a practice which, whatever insufficient defence may be set up for it on doctrinal grounds in works intended for merely popular use, is quite unpardonable in those designed for the use of scholars and for literary purposes: since Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees are quite as likely to be so needed as Proverbs and Esther. We may just observe that this crotchet is not entertained by German or Slavonic Protestants, and that the Bible Society's versions, cheap as they are, find no sale with them, because of the same foolish omission. A slight introductory sketch of the history of the version is prefixed to the volume, but it is not critical enough in execution, nor is any reference given us later than to the recensions of Lucian of Antioch and Hesychius. Nothing is said as to the labours of Aldus, of the Complutensian and Vatican editors, or of Grabe, Holmes, Mai, and Tischendorf; nor are we told what text is presented to us, though a brief inspection seems to show it to be the Roman. The translation is, on the whole, fairly executed, but the translator has allowed himself to be too much swayed by the A.V. and by the Prayer-Book version of the Psalter, so that not infrequently, while we get the general sense of a passage correctly enough, we do not get a literal version of the actual Greek text before us. Thus, for example, in Psalm lxxviii. 33, the phrase *καὶ ἐξέλιπον ἐν ματαιότητι αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν* is translated, 'And their days were consumed in vanity,' adopting here the Prayer-Book verb in a sense which the intransitive *ἐκλείπω* never has, whereas the literal rendering *failed* or *came short* would equally convey the idea of the Greek and, indeed, of the Hebrew original. Thus, this edition cannot be depended on by students unversed in Hellenistic Greek, for giving any finer shades of meaning, much less for throwing light on passages where the Hebrew text is now unintelligible, but where a clearer reading seems to have been in the hands of the Seventy. A book of this sort, to be of any real value, must be critical; and critical, unfortunately, is exactly what the volume before us is not.

*The Microscope of the New Testament.* By the late Rev. WILLIAM SEWELL, D.D. Edited by the Rev. W. J. CRICHTON, M.A. (London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons.)

FEW Anglican Churchmen of the present century have contributed more largely or more effectually to the advancement of Church and classical education in their more practical and higher aspects than the late Dr. W. Sewell, the well-known founder of S. Columba's

College, in Ireland, and of S. Peter's College, Radley, near Oxford. The closing and more secluded years of his long and laborious life were spent on a labour of delight in the composition of the *Microscope of the New Testament*, with a twofold object of disproving the destructive theories of modern neologians and of exploding the supposition that the Alexandrine Greek of the New Testament is not in its expression as minutely accurate as the Greek of the classics. With such unclassical forms as *σπικω* and others before us in the Greek Testament, we are scarcely in a position to accord a very high measure of success to Dr. Sewell's singularly ingenious attempt to put the Greek of the Greek Testament on the high level of the Greek of the classics in point of minute accuracy; we can, however, most cordially accord him our fullest gratitude for his most successful refutation of the various destructive theories set forth by the neologian school. Most fully, too, do we enter into the impression produced on Dr. Sewell's own mind by his microscopic study of the Greek Testament when he declares, 'Yet the more I study, the more minutely I look into the force, the exactness, the deep meaning of every single word, the profounder becomes my reverence, the more awful my sense of the importance of every jot and every tittle of Holy Writ.' The most striking and original portion of the work is that which treats of the origin of the Gospels as declared in Scripture itself. Here our author's arguments rest on testimony which even from a human standpoint is clearly conclusive, because it is concurrent and independent. The fact most prominently set forth, then, in dealing with the history of the four Gospels is that they were arrangements of narratives given by the Twelve Apostles, or confirmed by them, as in the case of S. Paul's Evangelium. According to Dr. Sewell's theory, the Gospel of S. John (against which the neologians have exhausted their arguments and learning) was provided, under Apostolical sanction, with the guarantee and testimony of the Apostolic body to its accuracy, to supply more advanced teaching in the deeper mysteries of the faith, when this became more needed. Dr. Sewell maintains that this Gospel was not published in the early days of the Church, because it was not desirable at that time to raise questions surrounded with strong temptations to human curiosity, controversy, and speculation. To such a twofold arrangement of Divine teaching, elementary and advanced, Dr. Sewell finds a parallel in our Church teaching, in the catechism for the young and the articles for the more advanced minds.

In his treatment of the force of particular words and phrases in the Greek Testament (and especially in the treatment of the Greek article and the tenses of Greek verbs), Dr. Sewell is for the most part especially happy, and the successful results of his subtle scholarship and discriminating criticism find a singular corroboration in the critical works of Canon Lightfoot, the greatest living authority on the subject. This is all the more satisfactory when we come to bear in mind that so many of Dr. Sewell's arguments in defence of the Divine origin of the Gospel are more or less intimately bound up with the special force he finds in the terms used. It is, however, not

a little remarkable that in discussing the exact sense to be assigned to the various Greek terms rendered in English by 'say' or 'speak,' to the confusion, if not to the entire exclusion, of the special force of the original, Dr. Sewell is not quite as satisfactory as we could wish, though he is sufficiently accurate to support his arguments by most of the distinctions he correctly points out and rightly insists upon. We cannot, for example, admit that Dr. Sewell exhausts the forces of λέγειν in the Greek Testament when he limits them to 'the telling of a tale or the employment of words in connexion with reasoning ;' nor can we accept without certain qualifications his remark that 'Our Lord six times over (Matt. v. 21-44) contrasts ἐπὶ ῥήθην, 'it was said,' and λέγω, 'I say.' Here we take λέγω as 'I command,' a sense given to the word even in classical Greek by Sophocles, Xenophon, and Demosthenes, and equivalent to κελεύω, but distinguished from it occasionally as a *verbal* and immediate command—a sense clearly assigned to it in many passages in the Greek Testament, as Matt. viii. 4, 9, Rom. iii. 19 (ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει). It is remarkable, too, how often S. Paul uses λέγω of commands of the Law, Scripture, and of God, and in 1 Cor. ix. 8 we find the remarkable contrast κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ and ὁ νόμος ταῦτα λέγει, which is repeated in xiv. 21-34. It is entirely owing to this sense (*command*) of λέγω that we have λόγος used in the sense of a *commandant*, as S. Mark vii. 13, 1 John ii. 7, where our translators in the Authorised Version have actually rendered it by 'commandment'—a sense, too, which has passed into our long-naturalised English term '*declogue*.' Two other cognate points we must here note—(1) that no sense could be more in harmony with the derivation and original sense of λέγω, *to lay down*, as in English we have *law* (*i.e.* what is *laid down* by authority as a rule) from the old Saxon *lagan* (to lay down), and (2) no sense could be more appropriate to our Blessed Lord's character as the Logos, speaking directly and immediately in His own person. It is precisely in this relation that we find λέγω contrasted with ἐπὶ ῥήθην by our Lord Himself. He speaks the *Divine command directly and immediately*, for His word is not spoken by the instrumentality of any prophet, according to the common formula, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λεγόντος. On the cognate term φημί Dr. Sewell tells us that, though 'so common in classical Greek,' it does not 'occur at all in the Greek Testament.' This is a singular oversight, and very misleading, for though φημί itself does not often occur, yet ἐφη is of constant occurrence, or rather recurrence, in every part of the Greek Testament; but what is peculiar about φημί is this, that its usage appears limited to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as 1 Cor. vii. 29 (τοῦτο δὲ φημι). (See also ch. x. 19, xv. 50.) The whole work, we regret to say, abounds in too many inadvertencies of this kind, happily not detracting much, if anything, from the solid strength and relevant application of the author's reasoning, which is well supported on other grounds, but such inadvertencies clearly indicate the sad want of Dr. Sewell's finishing touches and of his final revision for the press.

*Commentary on S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By FREDERICK ADOLPH PHILIPPI, Doctor and Ordinary Professor of Theology at Rostock. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

THIS first instalment of Professor Philippi's *Commentary* forms the second of the two volumes issued to the subscribers to their Foreign Theological Library by Messrs. Clark. It is not a work of first rank, but sufficiently able and learned, and what we should call Evangelical in the theological character of the notes. In the Introduction the author lays down (we think rightly), in opposition to Baur, Schwegler, and Volkmar, that the purpose of the Epistle was not polemic or apologetic, but friendly and hortatory. Nor can he see that it is directed against the Judaizing movement which desired to exclude Gentiles from the Church.

'No other opposition, then, to Pauline universalism is even conceivable than that which all Judaistic false teachers and sects actually adopted. Besides, it is such an opposition alone that the Apostle combats in the Roman Epistle. He contends only against righteousness by works, not against a designed exclusion of the Gentile world altogether; and, indeed, against the work-righteousness of Judaism, not against the work-righteousness of the Jewish Christian portion of the Roman Church. Had the Roman Jewish Christians followed this course, he would have attacked it directly, and have withstood them as he did the Galatian false teachers and the Galatian churches, and no consideration of any kind whatever would have induced the Gentile Apostle to treat gently a tendency striking at the very root of the Gospel. For the rest, the same view must be held if the Roman Church had adopted not the ordinary Galatian exclusivism, but the one described by Baur; for this, so far from being, as Dr. Baur supposes, gentler, was harsher than the Galatian form, seeing that it excluded even the conditional admission of the Gentile world to the Messianic salvation. If now, on the other hand, we are reminded (*Baur*, i. 331) that Paul did not in Rome, as in Galatia, see his own work overthrown, and had not to encounter opposition to his Apostolic authority as directly hostile; that here he had not to do with a Church that was going back, but with a Church, as he might hope, advancing from imperfection to perfection,—it is obvious to rejoin that in that case Paul would the more decisively and fearlessly have repelled false teachers so misleading the Church, and would have plainly and forcibly admonished and warned the Church itself. But here indeed everything returns to the starting-point, namely, to the hypothesis that not only the Judaistic heresy of the Apostolic age, but Apostolic Jewish Christianity in general, was merely a particularism holding righteousness by works'—(p. 16.)

The authenticity of this Epistle is so universally allowed both by friends and enemies, that the commentator is enabled to take this for granted. With the question of its date he does not deal.

*The Pauline Theory of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture: an Inquiry into the present Unsettled State of Opinion concerning the Nature of Personal Inspiration; with the view of placing on a Consistent and Scriptural Basis the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.* By WILLIAM ERSKINE ATWELL, D.D., Rector of Clonoe. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1878.)

HOLY SCRIPTURE often asserts, but never defines, its own inspiration



a fact which the writer of this laborious inquiry has not weighed perhaps as much as he ought to have done. Had he done so, he might not have thought it possible to distinguish so absolutely *inspiration* from *revelation*. He would understand by 'inspiration' an antecedent process to revelation, preparatory to it. He defines it as follows:—

'The supernatural actuating energy of the Spirit of God on the mind and heart of an individual, preparing him for the reception and for the manifestation of any gifts which he vouchsafes to bestow'—(p. 85).

After this he holds, knowledge is communicated to inspired men by revelation, which revelation includes (pp. 98, 99) the words in which it is subsequently to be expressed. We have the following singular result: that Dr. Atwell upholds the view known as 'verbal inspiration,' and yet thinks that the term 'inspiration' is improperly applied to the Holy Scriptures, or indeed to writings at all. It can *ex vi termini*, as he has defined it, have no meaning as applied to other than human beings.

The fact is that, however *we* may now draw a scientific distinction between them, the sacred writers use 'inspiration' and 'revelation' as convertible terms; and whether he says *ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλω ἀποκαλυφθῇ*, *revealed* (1 Cor. xiv. 23), or *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευτος*, *inspired* (2 Tim. iii. 16), S. Paul is obviously referring in different ways to the communication by the Divine Spirit of supernatural knowledge, without attempting minutely to define the stages or method of the process.

Such a course is in our view far preferable to that of over-curiously defining that which is not really within the scope of human knowledge, viz. the method of the Divine communications within the soul of man. But we cannot see that either Dr. Atwell's view, or the ordinary acceptance of inspiration, is untenable, or even that they exclude each other upon any important point so completely as he appears to suppose.

*Opera Patrum Apostolicorum.* Textum recensuit, Adnotationibus Criticis, Exegeticis, Historicis illustravit, Versionem Latinam, Prolegomena, Indices addidit FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS FUNK, SS. Theologiæ in Universitate Tubingensi Prof. P. O. Editio post Hefelianam quartam quinta. Tubingæ: In Librariâ Henrici Laupp, 1878.

THE present edition is founded on the fourth edition of the same edited in 1855 by the learned Dr. C. J. Hefele, then Professor of Theology at Tübingen. During the quarter of a century which has elapsed since that time, the materials for deciding upon the genuineness of treatises claiming to be the work of persons contemporary with the Apostles have greatly increased. Not to speak of Dressel's critical edition, which has gone through a second issue during the interval, the Greek text of the Shepherd of Hermas has been discovered and edited, and new versions of the Latin have been issued—

'Versio Latina altera vel Palatina quæ dicitur ac Versio Æthiopica.' A new and complete text of the Epistle of Barnabas was afforded by the discovery of *Codex Sinaiticus* in 1859;<sup>1</sup> and Hilgenfeld's edition (1877), based upon the Constantinopolitan MS., has done still more to settle the text of the Epistle. And, finally, the fourteen and a half chapters of the Epistle of Clement of Rome, missing up to that time in the extant copies, were supplied in 1875 from a MS. in the library 'of the most holy Sepulchre in Fanar of Constantinople,' hitherto unknown, and given to the world by Mgr. Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serre.

The work of Dr. Hefele had therefore in every respect become antiquated, and was committed to Dr. F. X. Funk to re-edit and adapt to the completer information of the present day. He has had to do part of his work twice over, because of one of these literary 'finds;' or, as he expresses it, 'codex ille Constantinopolitanus inventus est, ita ut commentarius in tres priores hujus libri scripturas, quem jam perfeceram, retractandus mihi esset.' He has properly excluded from the present edition the Pseudo-Ignatian Epistles, and promises in a separate form the *Corpus Pseudo-Ignatianum et Fragmenta Papiæ*, and other relics of antiquity.

The general execution of the work is painstaking and laborious. In Prolegomena and Notes the author has taken care to acquaint himself with the very latest publications bearing upon his subject. Thus we notice a reference to Mr. R. W. Cunningham's edition of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, published last year, and another to Dr. Lightfoot's 'Appendix' to his *Clement of Rome*. The work is learned and carefully executed, and is sure to be useful.

*An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century. Proposal for Catholic Communion.* By a MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. New Edition, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. Edited by HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. 8vo. pp. 327. (London: Rivingtons, 1879.)

THIS extremely interesting and timely volume is a reprint of a small book anonymously published in London in 1704, then brought out again at the seemingly most unpromising and unlikely place and date of Dublin, 1781, with two subsequent London issues in 1801 and 1812. These three republications of a brief treatise on such an abstract, and so to speak unpractical, topic, whose very authorship is still only conjectural, attest the weightiness of its tone, and the interest with which the writer has invested his subject. And this is all the more noticeable because he was obviously a man of what would in the present day be regarded as safe and moderate views, and by no means a 'Romanizer,' though he was certainly above the doctrinal level of the Nonjurors, amongst whom, in despite of their attacks on him, he has been erroneously reckoned; for that level, contrary to the opinion current amongst those who do not personally know their

<sup>1</sup> The statement in the 'Prefatio' may perhaps mislead. The complete text of Barnabas was not published until 1863 by Dressel.

writings, was far lower than that of the greater Stuart theologians. The arguments of our unknown author are modelled on the lines of those of Bishop Forbes in his *Considerationes Modeste*, and of Herbert Thorndike, both of whom he often quotes; but his especial merit is that of relieving the statement of the case from the ponderous load of learning with which nearly all theological literature of that age was encumbered, and putting it in a form sufficiently simple and telling to come home to the understandings of all fairly educated persons, however unversed in the technicalities of controversial divinity.

Mr. Oxenham's introduction, which occupies ninety-five pages of the volume, is chiefly devoted to a review of the various efforts at Reunion which have been made before and after the original appearance of this work, with especial reference to such names as Gregory Panzani, Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ (Christopher Davenport), Bishop Montague, Archbishop Wake, Dupin, Leibnitz, Spinola, Molanus, Bishop Jebb, and Bishop Doyle; and to an able survey of the religious collapse of Protestantism throughout the world—though he omits to point out that several still nominally orthodox American sects are now honeycombed through and through with Spiritualism—closing with an appeal from the standpoint of a moderate Roman Catholic for mutual explanations and concessions between England and Rome, in order to unite against the common enemy of Pagan unbelief. Of course there are several difficulties which we could not help raising, were negotiations of the sort begun, which naturally do not affect him equally, but on the whole he has put his case with much fairness. Hereupon follows the original treatise, occupying from page 37 to page 316, and itself divided into eighteen chapters, in which the chief questions treated are the Pope, Invocation of Saints, Images, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Purgatory, Penance and Indulgences, Confession, Tradition, Ceremonies, and Anglican Orders, and all with singular clearness, as well as with a charity of tone rarer than it is even now in handling polemical matters. Its curious anticipation of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* and Bishop A. P. Forbes's *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*—for it is clear that neither of these writers used it—is rightly pointed out by Mr. Oxenham, and we note the fact as testifying to an historical tradition which has never died out in the Church of England, and is indeed authoritatively embodied in Canon xxx. of 1604, to the effect that we have never broken off communion with Latin Christendom, and decline to retort the anathemas cast at us for retrenching certain things of which no one can deny that they are not only liable to abuse, but have actually been abused.

*The English Reformation: how it came about, and why we should uphold it.* By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D. 8vo. pp. xvi.-512. (London: Strahan and Co., 1879.)

No sharper contrast in tone to the anonymous *Eirenicon*, or indeed to Dr. Geikie's own meritorious *Life of Christ*, to which we had the pleasure of directing attention, could readily be found than this recent work of his, which is acridly partisan and indiscriminating throughout. Dr. Geikie is a very recent recruit to the Church from

some Presbyterian body, and while not as yet by any means at home in her annals, polity, and doctrine, has seemingly pushed his new admiration for Episcopacy so far as to assume the veracity, if not indeed the infallibility, of anything a bishop tells him, for we learn from his preface that some bishop wrote to inform him that the Reformation is menaced by a conspiracy, and that he at once accepted the inerrancy of this statement, setting to work upon the present book as the best means of counteracting the plot. The English Church Union, it would appear from Dr. Geikie, being a Ritualist league, and virtually Romish, is the head-quarters of this conspiracy (though, by the by, it has ten bishops on its roll, and its latest episcopal recruit, Bishop Medley of Fredericton, is senior by some years to any occupant of an English see, for he was consecrated in 1845, and Bishop Ollivant of Llandaff in 1849), and the 'official organs' of the Ritualists 'frankly admit that their object is ultimate union with Rome;' while the only way to deal with the present distress is for 'examining chaplains simply to give all candidates for ordination a paper of Protestant questions to answer,' so that 'those only who show themselves Protestants by their answers might be accepted.' Dr. Geikie is sure that, speaking the truth in love, as he does, his book will doubtless be assailed by the Romanists who have crept into English Holy Orders, but that the reader may feel confidence in its statements; and it may comfort Protestants to know that the doctrine of Apostolical Succession was not held by the Reformers who founded our Church under Elizabeth, for Presbyterian ordination was held valid till 1662. Having dealt with these questions elsewhere in this number of the *Church Quarterly Review*, we merely remind Dr. Geikie that, at any rate, his own previous ordination has certainly not been treated as valid, so that his personal experience must have made him aware that the Church of England under Victoria is agreed in this respect with the Church of England under Henry VII., and that there may therefore be other points of coincidence between them, as well as of common divergence from modern Protestantism, of which he, as a neophyte, is still unconscious. The history itself, commendable for the industry and the compression bestowed upon it, does not warrant that confidence of readers which its author demands, and does not even pretend to impartiality, but is utterly one-sided throughout, and it never seems to have occurred to Dr. Geikie that there must be something possible to be said for the side which Fisher and More espoused, and something against that which reckoned Crumwell and Poynt amongst its champions. With him, Queen Catharine of Aragon was an artful and crafty woman, the daughter of an infamous mother—Isabella the Catholic!—who entrapped the young and inexperienced Henry into a marriage unsuitable on the ground of disparity of years, as well as on that of her pre-contract with his brother. Here Dr. Geikie deliberately suppresses two weighty facts: first, that the second marriage to Prince Henry was almost exclusively the work of Henry VII., whose greed could not bear the notion of relinquishing the great dowry of the Infanta; and next, that the assumption of the

title of Duke of Cornwall and heir-apparent by Henry VIII. immediately on his brother's decease (he is so entitled in a State paper at least as early as October 1502, six months after Prince Arthur's death on April 2, 1502), shows that both Henries were fully aware that Catharine had been Arthur's wife in name alone. Had so much as a faint possibility existed that the marriage had been consummated, it would have been necessary to have waited some time for possible issue of the earlier marriage, and indeed, Henry was not created Prince of Wales till February 18, 1503. But this is not so material a point as the earlier one, since several heirs-apparent were never created Princes of Wales, though always ranking as Dukes of Cornwall by right of birth, *e.g.*, none of Henry VIII.'s three sons was ever created Prince of Wales, nor was Charles II. Contrariwise, no speck exists in his portrait of Anne Boleyn, and her 'purity' and 'chasteness' are dwelt on as if all authentic history did not brand her as the reverse. So, again, when speaking, naturally enough from his point of view, in strong condemnation of the prohibition and destruction of Tyndall's New Testament, Dr. Geikie studiously suppresses the notorious bibliographical fact that each part, as it was issued, appeared bound up with a virulent preface, which, to pious and honest churchmen of that day, read very much as one by Mr. Bradlaugh affixed to a new version, say, of the Old Testament, which he might think fit to circulate, would read to the eyes of Dr. Geikie and his friends. Once more, Thomas Crumwell, almost the worst character in all English history, is the object of strong panegyric, as 'faithful and true, unostentatious, charitable, merciful,' and only to be pitied for being the servant of so despotic a master. These few criticisms, not touching any doctrinal points whatever, will suffice to show that Dr. Geikie's work is historical in form only, but that its real character is that of a controversial lampoon, evidenced by its last words, where the wish is father to the thought: 'As for the conspirators, England loathes them, and will not rest till they be ejected from a Church whose wages they take while they betray her faith.' But as England never cared a tithe so much for her Church since the Reformation as she has done since the 'conspirators' breathed fresh life into it, we take leave to doubt both the present loathing and the future ejection.

There is just as rabid writing, however, to be had on the other side of the question, and Dr. F. G. Lee's *Historical Sketches of the Reformation* (8vo. pp. xi.-427. London: Griffith and Farran) have as little claim to impartiality as Dr. Geikie's book. The volume is dedicated to some lurking sect of Reformed Episcopalians, whom Dr. Lee is pleased to describe as 'the Prelates, Provosts, Priests, and Members of the Order of Corporate Reunion,' but who have not hitherto had sufficient confidence in their own titles and characters to give their names to the public, or indeed any tangible information as to their intentions and organisation.

Dr. Lee, albeit a man of ability, culture, and discursive, though inaccurate, reading, is deficient in the historical instinct. He lacks the capacity for comparing, weighing, and estimating evidence, so that he does not understand what any fact he adduces really proves.

What he has done in the volume before us, broadly speaking, is to collect some of the most salient examples of violence and crime during Henry VIII's reign, adding to them a couple of the judicial murders of Roman Catholic priests under Elizabeth. But while his collection would be a sufficient reply to the statement, were any one now bold enough to make it, that the Reformation in England was carried on in a perfectly orderly, equitable, godly, and merciful fashion, it does not help the reader in the smallest degree to solve the questions as to whether the Reformation itself was necessary or inevitable, on which side the balance of wrong-doing and cruelty was heavier, and what were the real causes at work all round in Church and State. In Dr. Lee's eyes everything and everybody connected with the Reformation were bad; everything belonging to the pre-Reformation Church was admirable, and he appears to have just as much and just as little reason for his opinions as Dr. Geikie. But, at any rate, his estimate of Thomas Crumwell agrees with that of Dr. S. R. Maitland—a man who possessed the true instincts of the historian—and is far more trustworthy than Dr. Geikie's panegyric; nor are there many people morally competent to express an opinion at all who will not agree with him as to the murders of Abbot Whiting and of the monks of the Charterhouse. But even for his own purpose, his work is of little practical value, for nearly every atrocity he chronicles was committed directly or indirectly by Henry VIII., and it is unnecessary to prove at length that he was never a Protestant at all. He did only the same kind of things, on a larger scale, which William II. and John had done before him, only that he had no Anselm or Langton to face him as they had. It is the story of what was done under Edward VI. and Elizabeth—though in many respects against the will of the latter sovereign—which would help to establish Dr. Lee's thesis, but he has not grasped the subject firmly enough in his own mind to realise that fact, nor that even so he would merely raise the question: 'What sort of training was that pre-Reformation system which produced such men as the Tudor Reformers?' nor yet to understand how his almost exclusive reference to R.C. authorities, whenever he does give any references at all, is likely to discredit him with readers who would like to be sure that both sides of the question have been duly considered by one who undertakes to teach them. Happily, if Canon Dixon should complete the great work he has begun, we shall at last possess a full and trustworthy history of the English Reformation, and can dispense thenceforward with mere *ex-parte* manifestoes such as these two we have been noticing.

*History of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland chiefly.* By Dr. K. R. HAGENBACH, late Professor in Ordinary of Theology at Basel. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

THE history of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century on the continent of Europe has been written so often and from so many standpoints that the present work might seem superfluous. But, not to mention such works as those of Döllinger, Fleury (which, however, even with the continuation, only comes down to the end of



the sixteenth century), and of the Swiss D'Aubigné, which are all accessible in English translations, we do not know that we have in English any original work on the general subject of the European Reformation, though there are many dealing with that particular department of it which relates to these Islands.<sup>1</sup> The work before us will, therefore, have a distinct sphere of usefulness open to it, and be welcome to English readers. Not that the author looks at the events of the Reformation from the peculiarly Anglican standpoint. He stands mid-way between all parties, and appears to lean somewhat more to the Swiss than to the purely Lutheran point of view. This is, perhaps, very natural, as Dr. Hagenbach is, we believe, himself a Swiss, and the substance of the work was originally delivered in the form of lectures before the University of Basel.

The present volume carries the narrative down to the period of the Peasant War, and to the height of the controversy concerning the Eucharist between Luther and Zwingle. Chapters I. and II. consist of an introductory sketch of the condition of the Church and of Europe generally at the time of the great religious upheaval, which is remarkably vivid and forceful, and appears to us more really admirable than the body of the history. So far as this is confined to the persons of the chief leaders—Luther, Melancthon, Erasmus, Zwingle—we have a terse and animated narrative, with which little fault is to be found. Dr. Hagenbach has a good eye for character, and picks out the salient traits so as generally to present a striking portrait. But when he leaves the delineation of individual character, he becomes more verbose. His conception of narrative seems to be the successive presentation of a vast variety of details. Thus, in his description of the progress of the reforming movement in Switzerland, we are taken from one little town to another, with somewhat wearisome iteration; and the same may be said as to the history of the movement in Germany. This may have been very natural in lecturing to a Swiss audience, but it is a mistake to retain the whole of the details in a work intended for the perusal of the general public of Europe. The analysis of the controversy on the nature of the Eucharist, as far as we have it in this volume, and without sympathising in the least with the line of opinion which the writer takes, seems to us acute and philosophical.

*The Student's English Church History, from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Silencing of Convocation in the Eighteenth Century.* By G. G. PERRY, M.A., Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Waddington. (London: John Murray.)

A FAIR, concise, and yet complete and very readable history, with, perhaps, the most trustworthy account we know of, of the Reformation movement. Every theological college student should read it as a matter of course. We only wish we could hope that every Churchman, whether lay or clerical, could be induced to do the same.

<sup>1</sup> We should except Canon Robertson's work.

*Principles of the Faith in relation to Sin. Topics for Thought in Times of Retreat.* Eleven Addresses delivered during a Retreat of Three Days to Persons living in the World. With an Introduction 'On the Neglect of Dogmatic Theology in the Church of England.' By ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1879.)

Two distinct and quite different subjects present themselves in considering this remarkable publication. The addresses which form the bulk of the book would not in themselves call for especial remark. That they only present, with considerable earnestness and skill, certain aspects of theology, we willingly acknowledge. They take a far wider range than a previous work of the author upon a similar subject, and though their staple consists of practical exhortations, which an unfriendly critic would probably call somewhat hysterical, yet they expound to a considerable extent the great principles of the Creed. There is, however, a marked tendency towards the border-lands of belief. The author's favourite phraseology is to a great extent that of Continental Christianity; and there are passages which seem to show that, although speaking professedly as an Anglican clergyman, he was far from firm in his allegiance to the doctrinal standards of Anglicanism.

Whatever may be the merits or the defects of the lectures, however, they will probably attract far less attention from readers than the Essay which precedes them, 'On the Neglect of Dogmatic Theology in the Church of England,' which, though written, as the author declares, as a loyal clergyman of the Church of England, yet will enable the intelligent reader to gather, not indistinctly, the nature of the mental process which has resulted in his secession from it.

For one thing, we cannot but think that his mental activity has been turned in upon itself and has become morbid. The present circumstances of our Church have, no doubt, somewhat restricted the external sphere of action within which the energies of Mr. Orby Shipley, and others of his school, can find healthful employment. External inaction forces the speculative faculties into unhealthy activity, and thus the theoretical difficulties, to some of which the Church of England, like every other institution upon earth, is open, had assumed in his mind such prominence as to cover his entire field of view, and appear to him altogether insupportable.

Something may also be attributed to the idiosyncrasy of the writer's mind. Some men shun responsibility and crave to devolve their judgment on someone else. A visible centre of unity—a concrete, living, and infallible voice to lead them into all truth—has irresistible charms for such. To throw decisions upon themselves, to insist upon their assuming the burden of responsibility for their religious belief, seems to them to be careless, if not cruel. The faculty of belief is more developed in them than that of reason. They may be harmless as doves, wise as serpents they are not, and hardly desire to be.

A third possible cause of this lamentable collapse may have been

the strong and very natural desire which Mr. Orby Shipley seems to have experienced for a Church ideally perfect while militant upon earth. It is a longing that many men have felt in more than one age. Mr. Orby Shipley will not fail to remember that the Cathari in the third century, the Donatists in the fourth, and the Puritans in the sixteenth, set before themselves exactly this ideal, and separated, in order to realise it, from their respective branches of the Catholic Church, very much as he has separated from the Church of England.

It would be futile for us gravely to traverse the various accusations which Mr. Orby Shipley, under the influence of one or other of these motives, has drawn out with wearisome iteration against the Anglican Church, to serve as a reason for the step which his will, rather than his judgment, had probably already determined upon. From one end to the other of his 'Introduction' he has laboriously been making out a case against the Church. And he does it all through in a manner which we can call nothing less than *insidious*. The judgments all go against us; but they are insinuated rather than plainly stated. Here, for instance:—

'Are these integral portions of a true Church, even in combination, of themselves and alone able to bear the weight that is laid upon them? Do they exhaust even the outward elements of which a Church that is entire and perfect in all its parts must be composed? That these notes of the Anglican Communion, as they may be considered, fail to bear the burden forced upon them will be evident when they are further examined, upon principles of faith which all will admit, and facts of history of which anyone may be assured. That they are not exhaustive of Catholic elements of ecclesiastical perfection must be allowed, if they shall be proved hereafter to fail in the preliminary trial'—(p. xxiii.)

And again:—

'Of course, the reason of these anomalies in practice—which it must be remembered are typical only of a large class and not exhaustive—is obvious, the want of discipline. And the want of discipline is caused, in part and to a large extent, by the subjection of the Church to the State—a subjection against which the Church does not rebel. As loyal members of the Church, we may accept this double-edged cause argumentatively. As a fact, we are committed to it. But we are not committed, in practice, to the results which ensue from this cause. These are condemned by loyal members. At the same time this further result cannot be denied in argument, and should be acted upon in life. If these causes and consequences are admitted to exist in one of the three outward elements of a Church theoretically intact in its organisation, the ecclesiastical status of that Church is not in the position in which it is assumed to be'—(p. xxiv).

And here is a very characteristic passage, which seems to sum up the writer's charges against the Church of his baptism:—

'If this principle be admitted, the terms at the outset employed by the theory of the average Anglican, namely, that the system of doctrine dogmatically asserted by the Church of England was perfect and complete, are abundantly justified. If this principle be denied, the Anglican obedience is involved in the charge that, for three centuries, her doctrinal teaching has fallen short of the Catholic faith. For instances of such

shortcoming and imperfection, it may suffice to point the reader to two questions which combine both faith and works. In the first place, the Church of England has failed to provide positive dogmatic teaching on a Sacrament of the Church, which possesses distinct Apostolic and Biblical authority, and of which her children, at their latest hour of life and at their sorest human need, have been cruelly and recklessly deprived—the Sacrament of Unction. In the second place, on a practice which in itself involves a life-long blessing, which is conformable with natural instinct, is the inevitable result of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and has the authority of some of the earliest and of all the greatest Fathers of the Church, the Church of England has preserved a painful and even an ignoble silence—the Invocation of Saints. The last Sacrament of the Church, whether theoretically or practically, is treated by her formularies in a series of negations only by the Church of England. No office has been appointed for its administration; and certain denials of its nature, claims and outward form, are alone predicated of it in the Thirty-nine Articles. Whilst, of the Christian privilege—for none affirm that Invocation is a duty—to ask the prayers of the holy dead, no direct and affirmative teaching is to be found in the Anglican obedience. The faithful are only warned against a certain “Romish doctrine concerning . . . Invocation of Saints,” which the Twenty-second Article fails to enunciate, and which, it may be truthfully added, learned men have failed accurately to discover. A loyal Churchman may accept the negations in regard to Unction, and may reject the abuses attributed to Invocation; and yet, in either case, respectively and for the edification and benefit of his own soul, he may honestly seek in principle and apply in practice “a more excellent way,” in the custom and belief of the Catholic Church.

‘If this estimate be just and in accordance with facts, the view maintained by the majority of educated Anglicans on the ecclesiastical status of the English Church must be pronounced to be wrong in theory, and to be out of harmony with the teaching of history. If, in the matter of discipline, during the last three hundred years, the state of the Church of England can be truthfully described in itself as chaotic; if, again, in the domain of worship, during the same period, her attitude has been that of imitator and debtor in relation to Western Christendom; if, lastly, in questions of dogma, the position of the ante-Reformation [qy. post-Reformation—*Rev.*] Anglican Communion, in comparison with the faith of Christendom, has been one of imperfection and shortcoming—then, in any one of these cases, and much more in any two or in all three of them, it cannot be justly affirmed and historically defended, that her status is that of an ecclesiastical body, perfect and complete in all its parts’—(p. xxvii.)

All this is lamentably weak, and only comes to this, that because the Church of England does not practise Extreme Unction, or encourage the Invocation of the Saints, she is no branch of the Catholic Church; which would equally demonstrate the non-existence of any Catholic Church at all for the first four hundred years of the Christian era. Can Mr. O. Shipley be ignorant that there is no trace of a practice of the Unction of the Sick before the letter of Pope Innocent I. to Decentius in A.D. 416?<sup>1</sup> And he ought to know, if he

<sup>1</sup> The true exposition of S. James is, of course, a very difficult question, upon which two commentators hardly agree. But one thing about it is clear, that it was intended to restore the sick to health, and not, like the modern rite, to act as a viaticum to the dying.

does not, that the Invocation of Saints is scarcely recognised in the great Primitive Liturgies, and not at all in the sense in which the modern Roman Church uses the term.

We need not, however, occupy further space with Mr. Orby Shipley's 'Apology.' It is not too much to say that it is made up of a series of allegations, some untrue, others irrelevant, all stated with more or less of exaggeration; and that if one and all were true to the letter, they would afford no adequate reason for such a violation of the most sacred pledges, and such a trampling under foot of the associations of a whole life as is involved in secession. Mr. Orby Shipley affords an instance of simpleness beyond what the writer of the Proverbs thought possible, when he wrote: *Surely, in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird*, for he has dallied with it for years, and it might have been hoped that he would have escaped. But the fact is, that it is merely the formal submission he has made now, the essential beliefs he had embraced long before.

*The Efficacy of Prayer: being the Donnellan Lectures for the year 1877.* By JOHN H. JELLETT, B.D., Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. (Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis, 1878.)

THESE lectures supply a need which had long existed, viz. an able and dispassionate statement of the position as to the right and duty of prayer to God, and the effects of such prayer when offered. They supply it with a power of demonstration and a wealth of grasp which leave hardly anything to be desired. We do not know that there is any part of the argument which has been left without attention; and the author's masterly reasoning out of the whole subject must, we think, give the discussion of the question, which, however, seems to have lulled for the moment, a fresh departure.

Mr. Jellett's view of prayer is that it is equally conceivable or inconceivable in the physical and in the spiritual sphere; and that in either it introduces the idea of *miracle*, i.e. of *effect immediately following a volition*. We foresee a difficulty here, for what is to be conceived as the function of the secondary causes, which Mr. Jellett does not deny, may intervene between the volition and the accomplishment of it? Where will he break the *nexus* of secondary causes in order to introduce his supposed *immediate volition*? We do not say that this question cannot be satisfactorily answered: but it is sure to be asked; and it would have been well to work out the point more fully. Meantime we may observe that *immediateness* of volition—we mean the direct connexion of the cause with the effect, without intervention of secondary causes—would seem to be the specific law of the spiritual world, as *mediateness* of causation is of the material world. Miracle is the exhibition of the higher laws in the sphere of the lower; and man, as a *mixta persona* of spirit and material body, is the sole being in whom and for whom such exhibition is apparently possible. *Below* him there are pure physical sequences alone; as long as spirit does not interfere, there is no need for, and no possibility of anything else. *Above* him again, there are direct volitions, followed by their accomplishment;

fiats, of which each is regal and creative. It is precisely where the two intersect that the phenomena which we call miraculous would naturally take place. Mr. Jellett lays down, somewhat hastily as we think, that man's will, without the intervention of man's body, has no power on anything external to himself.

There are facts alleged, by the professors of electro-biological science, which would seem to show the existence of a power in the human organism of *directly* influencing matter, at least in a rudimentary degree. And, certainly, if we push back our analysis as far as the point where the spiritual nature of man, the soul, expressing itself in the will, sets in motion, by some unexplained means, the series of physical acts which is to carry out its desire of whatever kind, we have there a distinct instance of *spirit influencing matter*. But if matter in the body, why not matter generally? We do not see what distinction can be drawn in this respect between *free matter* (so to speak) and matter already assimilated by some living organism. For it would seem that all matter is *potentially* at the disposal of a rational being, in a certain degree; and that only the exertion of the will is needful to draw such matter into the sphere of its own individual influence, *i.e.* 'to have power' over it.

We cannot here pursue the subject further. But it would seem to require a more complete treatment than Mr. Jellett was able to give it, and we would suggest the devoting of an appendix to its consideration in any future edition.

One other portion of the lectures deserves especial approval, *i.e.*, the successful demonstration in Lecture IV., that the efficacy of prayer is neither disproved nor can be disproved either by experiment or by statistics founded on the varying fortunes of persons or classes for whom prayer may be presumed to be offered.

Our readers will probably remember the irreverent and cynical proposal made a few years ago, that prayer for recovery should be concentrated, as an experiment, upon the sick in a particular ward of an hospital, and that the percentage of recoveries should be compared with that in another ward from the inmates of which prayer had been purposely withheld! It is very evident that the conditions proposed are impossible; for no two wards of sick could be put into exactly the same position to begin with, as to physical strength and vigour of constitution, or as to nature and virulence of their diseases, so that the experiment would not be *in pari materiâ*. But setting these considerations aside, Mr. Jellett observes:—

'Now, if prayer were an ordinary physical force, its effect would be, of course, independent of the motives of the person employing it. These motives are not, in such a case, to be reckoned among the essential conditions of the phenomenon, nor can their variation in anywise change the effect. But it is not so with prayer. Prayer, if it produce any effect, produces it by acting on the will of a sentient Being, who knows perfectly the motives by which the petitioner is actuated. Analogy, if we had no other reason, would lead us to infer, that the nature of these motives is an important element in determining the success or failure of such action. The motive of the petitioner being thus an essential part



of the phenomenon which we have to study, it is plain that we should not be justified in arguing from the case of prayer presented with one kind of motive to that of a prayer presented with a kind of motive wholly different. Assuming, therefore, that the experiment was tried, and that the result was to establish a perfectly uniform percentage of recovery as between the two wards, the legitimate inference would be this and no more—that prayer, *tried as an experiment*, will not succeed. If there be any theory which predicts the success of experimental prayer, the result of the experiment, if such were the result, would be fatal to it. But I am not aware that there is any such theory. Certainly it is not the Christian theory. The teaching of Christ with regard to the conditions necessary to successful prayer is quite different. He does not say—Try the experiment fairly, and you will succeed; but, "Whatsoever things ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." Christ teaches us, in fact, that trust in the goodness of God should precede prayer, not follow it'—(p. 61).

With this quotation we will take our leave of this assuredly most able and important work. We have seldom had a book before us which gives so unmistakable an impression of originality and mental power. We regard it as distinctly a new commencement in the discussion upon this subject; and the assailants of the efficacy of prayer must henceforth reckon with its facts and arguments first of all.

*Final Causes.* By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute, Professor at the Faculté des Lettres de Paris. Translated from the French by WILLIAM AFFLECK, B.D., with Preface by ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1878.)

To examine the arguments of this book in detail would occupy more time, as well as more space, than we have at our disposal; and we must content ourselves with a mere notice of the appearance of this translation. It has become the fashion among an influential school of physiologists, both in France and England, to discredit the argument from design, or the teleological argument, for the existence of a Creator. Such denial, too, appears inherent in the theory of evolution propounded by Mr. Darwin and his imitators.

The work of M. Janet is intended as a rejoinder to such denial. The original work, *Sur les Causes Finales*, was published in 1876, and has already had a great success. It is described, not unfairly, as really 'an event in science,' and, alike in purpose and execution, is a treatise of the greatest importance. The translation is excellently made; and Professor Flint adds a preface in which he shows much intelligent appreciation of the literature of the subject. It cannot be said that Theism stands or falls with a particular line of demonstration of its truth; but unquestionably a disproof of the instinctive inference of the mind from the multiplied indications of design in Nature would react most injuriously upon the faith of many minds in God; and it is therefore the Christian apologist's duty to support that inference—a duty which this treatise performs with a wealth of scientific knowledge and a logical acumen which will win the admiration of every reader.

VOL. VII.—NO. XIV. K K

*The Human Life of Christ revealing the Order of the Universe.* Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1877, with an Appendix. By G. S. DREW, M.A., sometime Scholar of St. John's College, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Lambeth. (London: Longmans and Co., 1878.)

IN these Lectures an attempt is made to present the life of Christ as the microcosm to which the macrocosm of collective humanity answers, or, more accurately, as the ideal type of human nature, in which all its relationships, whether with the Divine Creator, with the human beings by which it is surrounded, and, reflexively, with itself, are expressed and discharged. The idea is a true and good one. But in consequence, perhaps, of the vast inherent difficulties of the subject, there is a certain air of inadequacy about its treatment in these pages. Excellent as everything given here is, it too seldom has the effect of introducing the reader into, or even into the presence of that inner shrine which was the holiest of temples, because it was the abiding place of the Divine, 'the Temple of His Body.' Such, at least, is the impression left upon one reader. The several lectures deal with the Nature of the Godhead, the Ends of Creation, Oneness and Continuity of Life, Recognition of Supernatural Relationships. We can strongly recommend the last-mentioned of these, which is strikingly beautiful, and well worth perusal and consideration, especially at this time. A few sentences will serve as a specimen of the Lecture:—

'We know that this witness was constantly borne in mind by Him, and that this outward reference was habitually made in all His use of the consecrated institutions. This was distinctly intimated when He reminded the Pharisees that the sacredness of the gold in the Temple was derived from the Temple's sacredness, and that of the offerings from the consecration of the altar. For it is only an extended application of the same principle which is made when we speak of the Temple and Altar as being themselves the signs of something far higher and more important. Evidently they betoken the existence of a loftier sanctuary, and a nobler association, in which all things and places have been consecrated for God's service, and where all life is a sacrifice devoted to His glory.

And, indeed, apart from this view of our sacred times and places, as the portions of a far vaster and more glorious whole, the signs of its existence, and the instruments by which we may take our places in the midst of it, they cannot be understood any more than the consecrated gold could be rightly estimated apart from the Temple it was placed in, or than the incense and oblations could be duly thought of by one who did not consider the sacredness of the Altar which had been dedicated to receive them'—(pp. 104, 105).

*La Question Religieuse et la Solution Protestante.* Par E. RÉVEILLAUD. 12mo. (Paris: Grassart.)

THE work of M. E. Réveillaud is only a *brochure*; but it possesses much more importance than many a thick volume, and it is a striking sign of the times in the present disorganised state of France. The need of getting rid of clericalism is M. Réveillaud's first topic; priest-

craft, he says, is the curse of modern Europe ; it stops progress, and its attitude of antagonism towards the principles of the Revolution condemns it at once in the estimation of all liberal persons. So far, there is nothing very out of the way in our author's manifesto ; it is a repetition of the well-known denunciations of MM. Michelet, Quinet, and Génin—it is the profession of faith of a *libre-penseur*. M. Réveillaud, as a matter of fact, acknowledges frankly that, a Catholic by birth, he has long since abandoned a Church with which he never sympathised, and the testimony he is about to give in favour of religion must necessarily appear all the more weighty because it comes from an independent free-thinker, who as yet cannot be said to have any religious views.

This, indeed, is the original feature of M. Réveillaud's pamphlet and of his position in the world of thought : he agrees completely with the majority of self-styled liberals, so far as the elimination of Roman Catholicism is concerned ; but when they add, Therefore we must also suppress God, deny the existence of the soul, and worship matter, he stops and tells them distinctly that clericalism is not religion, and that without religion no society can live.

But, some one will object, the zealous and unremitting propagation of materialist and atheistic doctrines is surely the best way of delivering France from the incubus of priestcraft, and of destroying the power of the Papacy. No, replies our author ; 'l'humanité ne sera jamais matérialiste ni athée,' and it is precisely the dissemination of doctrines repugnant to mankind which has driven the *bourgeoisie* into the arms of the Jesuits.

We grant, another person will perhaps say, that the belief in God and in the immortality of the soul is one of the fundamental instincts of our nature ; we are enthusiastic champions of Deism ; but cannot we stop there ? and is Christianity, is the notion of a Church, is a liturgy, is worship, absolutely necessary ? Here M. Réveillaud, with a vigour and a power of criticism deserving the fullest praise, appreciates that school of spiritualist philosophers which, under the guidance of the late M. Victor Cousin, and backed by all the powers placed in the hands of the University of France, attempted thirty years ago to found for the benefit of the intelligent minority a theocracy independent of socialism and setting aside the authority of the Bible. 'Il faut une religion pour le peuple,' was then the favourite phrase of Sorbonne pedants ;—an absurd, a wicked distinction, says M. Réveillaud ; if religion is good, it is good for all ; if it is necessary for the *people*, it is quite as indispensable for the higher classes. His conclusion is that Protestantism possesses the key to the religious problem, and that the reconciliation between science and faith, liberty and authority, can be brought about in the bosom of any of the Churches sprung from the Reformation of the sixteenth century. From this brief account it will be seen that the chief merit of M. Réveillaud's pamphlet is not its theological power, but the fact that *at last* one of the most eminent of French free-thinkers has had the courage to denounce free-thought as a mistake.

*Nouvelles Etudes sur la Littérature Grecque moderne.* Par CH. GIDEL.  
8vo. (Paris : Maisonneuve.)

M. CHARLES GIDEL, professor of belles-lettres at the Lycée Fontanes in Paris, and well known as a distinguished scholar, has recently published a volume which deserves a brief notice at our hands. It is a collection of essays on modern Greek literature, and is intended to illustrate the destinies and influence of Hellenism from the downfall of the Roman Empire to the present day. We need scarcely tell our readers that in a volume of that kind ecclesiastical researches must occupy an important place, and if the subject is treated with anything like completeness, Patristic lore cannot but claim a large share of attention. M. Gidel has understood this admirably well, and if we review his work, it is because a considerable portion of it is, to all intents and purposes, a chapter in Church history.

The struggle between heathenism and early Christianity is the first subject discussed by our author. He shows very clearly how to a certain extent, and in the opinions of certain converts, the philosophical doctrines of Plato and Aristotle were regarded as a preparation to the teaching of the Gospel; was the new faith utterly incompatible with a judicious admiration of Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides? S. Paul himself quoted Menander and Epimenides; S. John had studied Philo: were not such precedents a sufficient justification for those Christians who clung to their classical traditions? So thought S. Clement Alexandrinus, S. Basil, and many others. M. Gidel explains this point in detail, and he contrasts the severity of S. Jerome with the liberal disposition of the Eastern neophytes. But a spirit of conciliation, and, if we may so say, of eclecticism can easily be carried too far; and besides, the peculiar tendencies of the Hellenic mind favoured another intellectual quality which soon degenerated into a positive scourge; we mean the fondness for argumentation and religious controversies. S. Gregory Nazianzen regretted that the study of the Scriptures was not limited to persons who had passed their youth, and S. Gregory of Nyssa gives us a curious though sad picture of the length to which discussions on points of theology were carried in Greece. M. Gidel shows that the dangers threatening the Latin Church were of an entirely different nature; they arose rather from the attitude of the temporal power and from the efforts of paganism than from the inner elaboration of theological systems, and whilst Eastern prelates, with a few notable exceptions, were too ready to become the flatterers of the emperor, the Bishop of Rome boldly maintained his authority against the representative of the old *senatus populusque Romanus*. Even in the development of monasticism we can easily trace the difference between the two churches; and it would be a mistake to suppose that the triumph of Christianity over heathen sympathies and traditions was brought about at once. In seasons of great calamities the people turned almost spontaneously to the gods who had so long crowned with victory the standards of the legions, and Zosimus says that when Alaric marched against

Rome, the necessity of offering sacrifices in the Capitol and the other heathen temples was enforced by the Senate.

Want of space prevents us from following M. Gidel through his most suggestive and interesting remarks on the results and influence of Greek culture during the early middle ages. His account of the monastery of Lerins, of the diffusion of classical learning in France, England, and Ireland, is extremely curious; and the whole of his essay deserves to be ranked amongst the most valuable disquisitions recently published on the subject of Hellenism considered in its relations to the theological and metaphysical literature of Western Europe.

*Histoire des Philosophes et des Théologiens Musulmans.* Par GUSTAVE DUGAT. 8vo. (Paris : Maisonneuve.)

A FEW years ago the French *Académie des Sciences morales et politiques* proposed as the subject of one of its periodical competitions the history of the struggle which took place between the philosophical and the theological schools under the dynasty of the Abassides : how did the strict followers of Mahomet hold their ground against the champions of free-thought? what was the share taken by the Soufis in the general movement, and what were the principal causes which led to the destruction of philosophy in the Eastern Khalifate? We see at once that, limited to its simpler expression, the programme set by the Academy meant a history of the opposition raised by free-thought against the strict champions of Mohammedan orthodoxy. It was a tempting subject, and well calculated to excite the enthusiasm of Oriental scholars. The result, we regret to say, was not successful, and no prize was awarded. M. Gustave Dugat, however, has resolved upon publishing the disquisition which he sent in, and his object in doing so is to call the attention of competent scholars to what he deems an interesting and important question.

If we attempt to follow in detail the evolution of metaphysical systems amongst the Mohammedans, we find exactly the same phenomena taking place as in Western Europe. Orthodoxy on one side, independent research on the other; here the most sensitive attachment to the rules and directions left by the Prophet; there an earnest desire of breaking through the barriers of literalism, and of turning to useful account the data of Greek philosophy. The Motazilites were the first to shake off the trammels of strict orthodoxy, and El-Mozdat, one of them, took the bold step of maintaining that the Koran was created. M. Dugat has described with wonderful accuracy and learning the contests which were perpetually going on between the representatives of the two principles, and although the details he gives us may sometimes seem too trifling, yet they cannot be neglected if we want to form for ourselves some adequate conception of the progress of philosophy in the Mohammedan world. The efforts of the Motazilites to establish a kind of rationalism were defeated by the Achalites, whose leader, El-Acasi, flourished towards the end of the ninth century; he proclaimed the dogma of the pre-existence of the Koran, defined clearly the attributes of God, and was the firmest upholder of the doctrine of predestination. With him.

began the second period of scholastic theology amongst the Arabs. The list of Ahasite thinkers includes some of the most distinguished Mussulmen; Scharastani, for instance, who is well known as the historian of the religious and metaphysical systems of Islamism.

Another celebrated representative of rationalism amongst the Mohammedans is Ibn-Sina, better known to Europeans by the name of Aircen. M. Dugat devotes a considerable space in his volume to the appreciation of this philosopher, who certainly exercised much influence during the Middle Ages, and whose claims to popularity were justified by the extent of his learning rather than by the originality of his genius. All the questions which occupied the attention of his contemporaries found a place in his writings; and when we think for a moment that the political events of the eleventh century, and the public functions which he discharged made constant demands upon his activity, we are perfectly amazed at the number of works he found time to compose. Ibn-Sina may be regarded as one of the best commentators of Aristotle, but he never became, nor did he wish to become anything else; he has not added one single thought to the system of the Stagirite, his one hundred and seven treatises do not contain one original remark. Although he made extraordinary concessions to Islam orthodoxy, he could not satisfy the champions of the faith, and it is against him that Al-Gezali directed his work on the *destruction of the philosophers*.

Mohammedanism, such as the Prophet himself had conceived it, and such as the rigid Mohammedans understood it, was threatened by two kinds of enemies: the metaphysicians on the one side, and the Christians on the other. Rationalism, in its turn, had to parry the attacks both of orthodoxy and of a class of thinkers whose views, tinged by scepticism, were strongly opposed to discussions and argumentation on religious truth. The pietists—for we may give them that name—did comparatively little to stop the progress of free-thought, and the great reaction against the rationalists sprung from the midst of the practical theologians, who, with a zeal, a tenacity, and a skill which brooked no obstacles, enforced in every possible way absolute obedience to the text of the Koran. As a critic ingeniously remarks, Islamism has for its bulwarks a circle of iron, through which progress cannot possibly make way.

The volume of M. Dugat is only a sketch, and the author is the first to say so; it would be unfair then to judge it too severely. Its radical defect, we think, is the unmethodical way in which it is composed: if the best way of dealing with the subject had been to put together a number of monographs—to open, so to say, a gallery of pictures—the problem would be solved; but a history of metaphysics demands a totally different style of treatment. M. Dugat, we think, has not allowed himself space enough, and the *programme* set by the *Académie des Sciences morales et politiques* gave plenty of materials for two volumes instead of one. Our remarks, we must add in all justice, only bear upon the form, the composition, not upon the work itself; studied from this point of view, the *Histoire des Philosophes* challenges criticism, and taken in connexion with the late Professor



Munk's *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, it is the best source of information we have on an important and interesting episode in the history of metaphysical literature. We recommend it most warmly to those amongst our readers who would obtain an accurate knowledge of the origin and progress of Mohammedanism; the copious notes and bibliographical indications it contains are not the least valuable part of the work.

*Bible Echoes in Ancient Classics.* By CRAUFURD TAIT RAMAGE, LL.D. 8vo. pp. viii.—424. (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1878), published just at the time of its venerable compiler's death, is a book of considerable interest and wide reading. It was suggested to Dr. Ramage in the course of forming other collections of quotations, and now appears as an independent compilation, the idea being to illustrate a great number of Scripture texts by somewhat similar expressions in classical authors. Dr. Ramage believed himself to be practically first in the field, since the two authors he cites, Duport and Luxdorph, confined themselves to Homer and Plato. But the Abate Filippo Picinelli of Milan, Canon of the Lateran, published, late in the seventeenth century, a still larger collection of the same kind, extending to the entire Bible, under the title of *Lumi riflessi della Sacra Scrittura*, of which a Latin version, *Lumina Reflexa*, by Canon Augustine Erath was printed at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1702. The two works may be profitably compared with one another; and it will be the judgment of any dispassionate critic that they are supplementary rather than competing, though, of course, they go over a great deal of the very same ground. Thus, on the first two verses of Genesis, Dr. Ramage quotes Homer, Hesiod, the Orphic verses, Euripides, Aristotle, Maximus Tyrius, Cicero (twice), Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Silius Italicus, Lucian, and Valerius Flaccus. Picinelli quotes Diogenes Laertius, Sophocles, the Sibylline Oracles, Virgil, Manilius, Ovid, and Plato; and on the whole, the earlier compiler adheres more closely to the very words of the text he desires to illustrate. Sometimes Dr. Ramage is so indirectly allusive as to give very little help at all, as in his notes on S. Matthew xii. 8, 'The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath Day,' where, with the best possible will, we are unable to find any appropriateness in the one quotation from Livy and three from Valerius Maximus appended; while, on the other hand, he has but one illustration of the Canticles, from Theocritus, on the little foxes of ii. 15, while Picinelli has no fewer than one hundred and twenty-five notes on this single book, some of them containing two, three, or four illustrative quotations. Certainly, Virgil's *Culex*, 103, on Canticles i. 7, Theocrit. *Idyll.* xx. 26, on iv. 11, and Lucretius iv. 1173, on v. 5, to cite no others, are at the least as noteworthy as the one Dr. Ramage singled out. But every now and then there comes a thoroughly happy quotation in his book, such as is not only a real delight to the scholar, whose attention it may have escaped before, but cannot fail to give pleasure to any one with literary tastes who will be at the pains even to read the English version which he has subjoined. The book ought to be a treasure to all who henceforward write commen-

raries on Scripture for the learned, but we recommend them strongly, when procuring it, as they can, of course, most readily do, not to fail in searching for Picinelli, whose now rare work is thoroughly well worth possessing; if, indeed, some one do not go further, and reprint it, taking care to give the Greek in several places where Picinelli has contented himself with supplying a Latin version of it, though he does not invariably adopt this inconvenient plan.

Numerous as county histories are, it is not a little singular how rare are diocesan compilations of a similar kind, and what a field of historical and archæological research lies open to almost any chance comer. While many famous English sees still lack a chronicler, one has been found to compile the records of a comparatively obscure Irish one, and to do his work, on the whole, so well as to be very helpful as a guide to future labourers on a like theme. We refer to Canon Dwyer's work on *The Diocese of Killaloe from the Reformation till the Close of the Eighteenth Century*, 8vo. pp. 602. (Dublin: Hodges, Foster, and Figgis, 1878).

The writer has at the outset put himself at a much greater disadvantage, in beginning with the post-Reformation annals, than one who should do the like with an English diocese; for there are few more arid and thankless stretches of ecclesiastical history than that of the Reformed Irish Church, from the accession of Edward VI. down to this year of grace 1879; whereas the early Church records of Ireland, largely mythical as they undoubtedly are, give us the only part of the chronicles of that unfortunate country which the student can peruse with any gleam of satisfaction; for the best account of its civil annals, as an Irish wit of the last century remarked, is 'the continuation of Rapine.' But Canon Dwyer has made a great deal out of his unpromising materials, and though we do not conceal our languid interest in some of his copious details, there is much for which we are thankful, not the less for the comparative absence of controversy, which might have been dragged in to any extent with only too much ease. After an introductory chapter on architectural and topographical questions, Canon Dwyer sets himself to his main task, and treats his subject as a continuous narrative, in the chronological order of the reigns from Henry VIII. to William III. inclusive, instead of devoting separate chapters to the several categories under which the information he supplies might be classed, such as the succession of Bishops, the erection of parishes, &c. Thus, he begins with the Supremacy Act of 1537, and comes down to its legitimate consequent, the Penal Laws of William III., and gives the whole intervening history, with copious selections from various documents, in one stream. He is under the impression that the religion of the Norman conquerors under Henry II. was different from that of the native Irish Church, and was imposed on the Celts much as Islam was forced by the Mogul Emperors on the Brahmin population of India, and clearly thinks that the existing Irish Church is a trustworthy representative of the older belief—a conclusion in which we are quite unable to follow him. But he does not disguise

the lamentable condition of religion which prevailed during almost the whole period of which he treats, and the individuality of the records he produces conveys a much livelier notion to the reader of the real state of the Irish Church during the century and a half he illustrates, than could possibly be derived from a general history, in which broad outlines only, with perhaps an occasional striking episode inserted, are to be found. There are copious appendices, containing the succession of Bishops, a history of the Cathedral, the topography of the parishes, a selection of deeds *temp.* Elizabeth and James I., a sketch of the effects on ownership and religion produced by the civil laws as to property, a list of the castles or fortified houses in the county Clare, &c.; and Mr. Dwyer also gives us several plates, chiefly portraits and architectural views, which add much to the interest of his elaborate and painstaking volume, which we again recommend as pointing out a line of study which has not been followed nearly so much as it deserves.

*Wykehamica: a History of Winchester College and Commoners, from the Foundation to the Present Day.* By the Rev. H. C. ADAMS, M.A., Vicar of Dry Sandford, Berks. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1878).

THIS carefully compiled volume is one of that class of books which has not to create a public for itself, but finds one ready made. The attachment which our great Public Schools, and notably Winchester, have the power of inspiring, is one of the most abiding of ties; and we do not doubt that all past and present members of Wykeham's noble institution will make a point of buying the book as a mere matter of *esprit de corps* and loyal feeling to their School. To make assurance doubly sure, we find that the book is dedicated to all 'Winchesters,' present or past, in as elegant a 'copy' of elegiac verses as the author can ever have given up during his *status pupillaris* there:

'Omnibus hunc librum—felici prodeat horâ—  
Wiccamicis, Wykami filius ipse dico.  
Scilicet agnoscunt Wykamum quicumque parentem,  
Quemvis Wiccamicum fratris amore colunt.'

It is not only a series of very interesting traditions of the School, but also a repertory of carefully compiled facts and dates, and follows the line of the successive Head Masters, not that of the Wardens; but neither these nor any other distinguished men who were at any time intimately connected with the School appear to have been omitted, and a biographical sketch is given of each. The peculiarity of the book is the large space given to School customs and the miscellaneous School *ana* which make such charming table-talk, and will not be thought excessive in its present collected form by Winchester men, who are the persons chiefly concerned.

*Cyprus: its History, its present Resources, and Future Prospects.* By R. HAMILTON LANG, late H.M. Consul for the Island of Cyprus. With two Illustrations. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1878.)

THE author of this volume is a man of business, and he has written

a business-like book, which performs the task proposed in the title with straightforward brevity and refrains systematically from every digression. It gives simple, straightforward, and, so far as we are enabled to judge, trustworthy statements, which will unquestionably be of material use to all who wish to acquaint themselves with the characteristics of the island. Mr. Hamilton Lang has followed exactly the plan indicated in his title, and the pages from 1 to 190 inclusive are occupied with a sketch of the history of Cyprus from the earliest times to our own day. Then follows a series of chapters on the agriculture and produce of Cyprus, the prevailing weather and rainfall, the minerals known to exist and actually worked, or only suspected to be obtainable in various parts of the island, and, lastly, on the character of the administration and fiscal arrangements under the Turkish rule. He strongly advises the retaining of these, at all events, provisionally, as having been proved to be well adapted to the habits and resources of the people. Even the *dîmes*, or Government tithe of the produce of the land, he would continue in force, only regulating the collection, and removing from the Government *employés* the chief inducement to peculate, by giving them sufficient salaries. For all subordinate offices he would employ natives of the island; and, he says,—

'Plenty of perfectly capable men can be found in the island for subordinate offices, and under a strict control they will do their work conscientiously. "Like master, like servant." When speculation and corruption are punished with dismissal and disgrace, they will soon disappear, and it is amazing how rapidly the moral purity of the source purifies the stream. But there must be no false economy in refusing to give *employés* the comfortable means of subsistence. This error is at the base of all the corruption in Turkey, and until it is rectified there is no hope of honesty in administration'—(p. 266).

Thus his recommendations are—the practice of strict economy; but few English officials; a majority of native *employés*, and those sufficiently remunerated; the careful and discriminating development of existing industries, especially of agriculture, and the discovery and use of the material riches of the island. Under these conditions, he affirms, the possession of Cyprus may be made to pay. It ought not to be made 'an expensive toy,' but 'it is cheap at the price we have engaged to pay to the Porte,' and at the existing standard of taxation, 'the people of Cyprus will, in a few years, be the most favoured nation in the world.' The probability is, we should say, that as they are better governed, they will have to pay more for it; at all events, that is the rule everywhere else; but that question may well be left to the future. Upon one matter, that of immigration, he speaks very decidedly. He does not think Cyprus a promising field for colonisation by Englishmen. Though his own experience as the lessee of a farm and a practical agriculturist was altogether favourable, yet that must, it is evident, be confined to a comparatively small number of persons, and it would seem that the only persons who can labour constantly in the climate of Cyprus are the native-born population. And yet he insists that, if the needful conditions are complied with,

it is the reverse of unhealthy. But then these conditions seem to exclude labour in the open air. So the peasantry of Cyprus have, and are likely to have, a monopoly of their occupation.

*Royal Windsor.* By WILLIAM HEFWORTH DIXON. 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1879.)

WE imagine that these two volumes are but the first portion of an account of that royal castle which, if it has not been the scene of such sensational incidents as the London fortress, over the annals of which the same author has expended much diligent research, is, on the other hand, at the present day more closely identified, in the view not only of the nation, but of the world at large, with our sovereigns than any other of the royal residences. To see Windsor is regarded by every foreign traveller in England as a duty no less imperative than to see London itself; and an Englishman need not fear being accused of unreasonable prejudice if he believes that though Versailles or the Escorial may be of greater extent, yet, when its superb site on that 'stately brow,' its terrace with the view reaching from it over nine counties, with the 'silver-winding' Thames in the foreground, and in the rear the far-spreading park, where oak, chestnut, elm, and beech all flourish in equal luxuriance, Windsor may well challenge a comparison for stately majesty, and still more for solid comfort, with the proudest palace of king or emperor. Mr. Dixon writes sometimes in the spirit of an antiquary and sometimes in that of a troubadour, and in each character with a genuine enthusiasm for his subject, which enables him to give an interest to the driest details of ground plans and architecture, or leads him at times to diversify his narrative with episodes, like those of Pindar, connected with his immediate subject by but a slender thread.

The situation of Windsor was too strong for it to fail to attract the military eye of the Conqueror, though its admirers of the present day will be disappointed at learning that it was rather as a prison for his enemies than as a stronghold or pleasant dwelling-place for himself that he erected his first building on the hill. It was in this character that the Round Tower arose, which still proudly commands the rest of the castle; and it was his younger son, Henry, who first appreciated the beauty of its situation, 'hidden in a screen of oaks,' and built 'the first king's house for his queen and family' (i. 21); while, by a curious irony of fate, it was under the base rule of the only coward of the grand Plantagenet race that the strength of the fortress was first proved. Louis, the Prince of France, invaded England. In a very short time he made himself master of all the southern counties, with the exception of two castles. One was Dover, the other was Windsor. The one sign of sagacity that the base King showed was the entrusting its defence to a brave Breton knight, Engelard de Cicogny; for Engelard deserved the trust reposed in him. He collected supplies; he scaped the hill; with well-judged sallies he issued out upon the slopes (now the favourite shady walks of three successive sovereigns, then the camping ground of the French besiegers and the angry barons who had invited them)

and destroyed the military engines, the arbalists and catapults, on which the enemy had relied. At the end of a month the siege, conducted by Prince Louis's own cousin, the Comte de Nevers, was raised; and, at John's death, Engelard had the honour of handing over to the guardians of his youthful son and successor the castle which he had so bravely and so successfully defended (i. 131).

In the Middle Ages 'Edward of Windsor is the greatest figure in connexion with the royal edifice. Windsor Castle was the place of his birth and of his christening, the home of his married love, the birthplace of three of his children, the scene of his gallant son's marriage and of his pious consort's death' (i. 170). He greatly enlarged it, and two of those of whose genius he availed himself in the execution of his princely designs have bequeathed to us names of historical fame, William of Wykeham, the munificent patron of learning, to whom the nation is indebted for Winchester School and New College; and the soldier, diplomatist, and poet Geoffrey Chaucer, who in the last year of the reign added the labours of 'Master of the King's Works' to the more imaginative duties of poet-laureate. But for that portion of our author's mind which we have ventured to call his troubadour spirit the deed of Edward III. which seems to possess the greatest attraction was his installation of S. George as the patron saint of Windsor, of the Garter, and of the whole nation. Mr. Dixon passes over without notice Gibbon's identification of the saint with 'the infamous George of Cappadocia' (*Decline and Fall*, c. xxiii.), and affirms him to have been a native of Lydda, who, in some manner and for some cause which he does not explain, had come to be greatly revered in the East. 'By Cypriote, Greek, and Syrian he was worshipped as a sovereign of the sea, by Frank and Saracen as a protector of fighting men on shore; to Richard's eyes' (while awaiting Berengaria in Cyprus) 'he was presented as a champion of the Cross' (i. 196). And in each point of view he was no unfit type of the English character, and no unworthy representative of the nation which has never had a superior on land, nor an equal on the sea, nor a rival in the zeal and success with which she has spread the knowledge of the Saviour among the fiercest tribes of the two continents, the most benighted islanders of the two oceans.

We have no space to accompany our author through his narrative of the incidents which connect with the castle the other sovereigns for the first 400 years after the Conquest. The events of 400 years more remain to be related. They will not be less interesting. He has still to relate how Elizabeth added towers and gateways; how Charles planned the noblest avenue in Europe; how the third George strolled, farmerlike, about his domain, sometimes mistaken by a butcher for a grazier, and sometimes by a saucy Eton boy offered a bribe as one of his own keepers; how under his son the somewhat narrow residence grew into the superb palace which is now one of the chief ornaments of the land; perhaps too, if such a tale can be made compatible with the reverence due to the living, how within our own memories the castle was the scene of our present beloved Sovereign's earliest happiness, and, alas! of her deepest woes.



*Conversations with M. Thiers, M. Guizot, and other distinguished persons during the Second Empire.* By the late W. NASSAU SENIOR. Edited by his daughter, M. C. M. SIMPSON. 2 vols. (London, 1878.)

THESE volumes may be considered a sort of sequel to those recording the same gentleman's conversations with some of the leaders of public opinion in Paris between 1848-1852, published by himself some years ago. And to an English reader they are more interesting, inasmuch as they deal with a period during which France, under its new Emperor, was drawing closer to England; the latter part of the first volume, embracing a period when the two nations were jointly preparing for the Crimean War; and the earlier pages of the second, the years when they were actually engaged in it. Words spoken at such a time, by such men, two of whom had been Prime Ministers of the country, and one of whom was destined hereafter, in a crisis of unexampled trouble, to fill a post, even more arduous than that of any constitutional minister, have a real title to be considered important contributions to future histories of both nations.

The scenes in which M. Guizot is introduced, though they represent him as somewhat less under the influence of prejudice than M. Thiers, scarcely give one the impression of equal shrewdness. In the spring of 1854, M. Guizot regarded 'the return of Henri V. and the succession of the Comte de Paris as events which might be expected with more confidence than could often be extended to the future of France'—(i. 148); while, almost at the same time, M. Thiers foresaw in the necessity for war, which was a part of the Emperor's creed, a probability of France having to submit to the loss of Alsace and Lorraine (i. 247)—a danger the possibility of which, we feel confident, had not at this time occurred to the mind of any other politician in France, if we might not say in Europe.

But our English readers will be more interested in the passages which refer to ourselves. Among those with whom Mr. Senior conversed was King Leopold—a prince who had had and still enjoyed unusual opportunities of understanding English parties and interests. He, speaking in 1852, tells Mr. Senior that the 'Manchester School is a very dangerous one. Economy and retrenchment are good things, but not as the basis of a party.' And he especially condemns 'Cobden and his associates' as men whose 'theories may do unspeakable mischief, not only to England but to Europe'—(i. 95). And an observation of M. Dumont, who had been Minister of Finance in Guizot's Ministry, has a still greater bearing on the present state of affairs; since, though he was referring to the Crimean War and the natural difference between the objects of his country and ours in that enterprise, his remarks have no indirect bearing on one of the most striking of Lord Beaconsfield's recent measures—the erection of the British standard in Cyprus. M. Dumont did not see that France would have been injured if the Czar had been allowed to establish the Protectorate which he claimed.

'But,' says he to Mr. Senior, 'the case is different with you. You have real interests to defend. You have to raise a barrier between

Russia and Persia. You have to keep the Russian Navy out of the Mediterranean. You have to retain the commerce of Turkey and the Black Sea. It was worth *your* while to make a great war for objects as great as these, especially when you found us mad enough to join you'—(i. 282).

If it was worth our while to make war, it must surely be far better worth while to adopt measures which should gain the same ends without war.

On one point Frenchmen of all parties agreed: on the great value they attached to the alliance of England. It is as visible in Montalembert as in Thiers or Guizot; in 1860 as in 1853. Indeed, Montalembert, deploring the gradual approaches which our Ministers, in 1860, were making towards democracy, apparently found his strongest objections in the degree in which their course 'is calculated to disturb our international relations'—(ii. 307). We on our part do also value it highly, though our reasons probably differ from those which influence any party in France. They look on it, if it could be made indissoluble, as able to ensure them success in war. We regard it as a security for peace, since few rulers of any country would think it wise to encounter England and France united. But there is also another, and, perhaps, a still more important way in which it may possibly hereafter contribute to the preservation of peace, namely, if our influence with our ally should be exerted, as it certainly could be (and, if so exerted, should prove sufficient), to prevent France from rushing into a war, which it is no secret is looked forward to by a large party, perhaps by some members of every party in France. Perhaps the most practically mischievous ingredient in the extortion of Bessarabia by Russia, is the precedent it may seem to have established that a nation is justified in any degree of chicanery or violence, or both combined, even in the spoliation of its own allies, for the recovery of territory which it has once lost. What Bessarabia was to Gortschakoff and the Czar, Alsace and Lorraine notoriously are to thousands of Frenchmen, provinces to be recovered at any sacrifice. If, when the time shall come, our alliance with France shall then give us influence enough with her to dissuade her from renewing the war with Germany, which could hardly be confined to those two nations, then the Anglo-French alliance would not only be a benefit to the two countries thus united, but a blessing to all Europe and to humanity.

Our space has only allowed us to indicate very superficially the many subjects of interest which are discussed in these volumes; but there is hardly a page of them from which those who desire information on the general politics of Europe will not derive both instruction and entertainment.

*Le Comte de Fersen et la Cour de France; Extrait des Papiers du Grand Maréchal de Suède, Comte Axel de Fersen.* Publié par son petit-neveu le BARON R. M. de KLINGKONSTROM. 2 vols. (Paris: Didot.)

AT the very time when Burke was lamenting in one of the most

eloquent pages of the English language the extinction of the age of chivalry, of that 'generous loyalty to rank and sex' which, as it seemed to his impassioned fears, we should 'never, never more behold,' more than one gallant spirit in the very city whose infamies were exciting the writer's indignant horror was showing with the most disinterested and unwearied activity that the most vivid eloquence is not to be taken literally, that the most sweeping denunciations admit of some exceptions. The chief of them was the young noble whose journals and correspondence are the subject of our present notice, the Count de Fersen. It is believed that he was originally of Scotch extraction, and a descendant of one of those hardy adventurers whom a zeal for the exiled daughter of their king, the fair Princess Elizabeth, enlisted under the banner of her most redoubtable champion, the great Gustavus Adolphus, and who remained in Sweden even after the death of the hero. Chivalrous devotion to princesses in trouble and danger may be said, therefore, to have been hereditary in his family. And there never was a crisis so calculated to call such a feeling into action as that which the state of France presented in the first year of the Revolution. In his early youth the Count was sent to travel in foreign countries to complete his education. He spent some months in England; but he made a longer sojourn in France, where he was treated by the King and Queen with marked distinction, which captivated him so much that he obtained the leave of his own sovereign to join himself as a volunteer to the force which M. de Rochambeau led in 1779 to the assistance of the North American colonies, which had revolted from the English Crown. He very early began to keep a journal, and the commencement of the first volume of this publication is occupied with a lively account of the events of the latter years of the American war, the treason of Arnold, the death of Major André, Cornwallis's surrender, Rodney's victory, &c. He continued that journal for many years, but unfortunately that part of it which related his experiences between the time of his return from America to June 1791 is lost. It is well known how important a part he played in the attempt of the unhappy sovereigns of France to free themselves from the thralldom of the Constituent Assembly and the Paris mob, which failed so miserably at Varennes. But, the friend in Paris to whom, on his departure, he had entrusted his journal burnt it from a fear that his own safety might be compromised if he were found to be possessed of any papers belonging to a man under the deadly displeasure of the Jacobins. We have, however, in these volumes many letters referring to the events which took place in Paris during the first two years of the Revolution, for he was more than once in 1788 and 1789 employed by his own sovereign as a confidential envoy to Louis. He was present at Versailles on the terrible 5th of October, 1789; and in the winter of that year he was detached from his regiment and sent by Gustavus to Paris 'to remain in attendance on the King of France, to transmit letters between the two sovereigns, to interpret from time to time his own master's sentiments to the King and Queen, in short, to do all in his power to facilitate the communications between the two

Courts' (*Introd.* lii). His letters to his friends in Sweden, and especially those to the Baron de Taube, Gustavus's chamberlain, many of which were manifestly intended to be shown to the King himself, are accordingly full of interest, as disclosing the view of affairs taken by Louis, still oftener by the Queen, and occasionally, so far as the writer could collect them, the aims of their secret or avowed enemies. One furnishes an anecdote, which we do not recollect to have seen elsewhere, strikingly illustrative of the incurable levity of the French nation, of which Marie Antoinette so often complains as the source of so many of her miseries. The revolutionary party at the time and since have exhausted their powers of description in extolling the grandeur of the festival ordained by the municipality to celebrate the first anniversary of the capture of the Bastille. De Fersen, who witnessed it, tells that,

'august, splendid, and imposing as it might have been, it was made ridiculous by the disorder and indecency which reigned in every part of it. There was no order; no one was in his place; the soldiers who should have kept the ground were under no discipline and obeyed nobody, but ran up and down dancing and singing, and at last, to fill up the time till the arrival of the King and the municipal authorities, they seized a priest and two monks, put grenadiers' shakos on their heads and muskets on their shoulders, and in this guise paraded them round the amphitheatre till they put De Fersen in mind of a band of savages leading some Christian prisoner up to the altar of their gods before they ate him.' (July 16, 1790.)

After the return of the Royal Family from Varennes his correspondence has a deeper interest. He had fled to Brussels, and from that city the Queen kept up an incessant correspondence with him, Gustavus having specially placed him at her service as a means of communication with the different foreign Powers to whom alone it seemed that the unhappy prisoners in Paris could look for aid. Mercy was at Brussels too; but as he was, from his duty as the Emperor Leopold's ambassador, necessarily bound to shape his conduct by the plans of his master, 'a dish of skimmed milk,' whom it was wholly impossible 'to stir up to any honourable action,' the Queen, heartsick at her brother's lukewarmness, not unnaturally preferred consulting and employing the aid of De Fersen, whose sympathy with her troubles led him to fulfil, and often to anticipate, her wishes with a zealous devotion that she looked for in vain among her own subjects. With what disinterested earnestness he devoted himself to her service we may gather from a few short sentences in one of his letters to her in the autumn of 1791. Her confidence in him had provoked jealousy. Necker's daughter was married to M. de Staël, the Danish envoy, and she probably thought a display of confidence in anyone else a disparagement of her father, to whom, as Napoleon truly said, the greater part of the horrors of the Revolution are to be ascribed.

'Staël says horrible things of me. He has made a party against me, who blame my conduct, saying that I am guided by nothing but ambition, and that I have undone you and the King. The Spanish ambassador and many others have been led to take this view. They are right. I

had the ambition to serve you, and all my life I shall grieve that I did not succeed. I did desire to acquit myself of some part of the obligations under which it is so pleasing to me to be to you; and I did wish to show people that a man may be attached to such as you without any other motive of interest. All the rest of my conduct would have proved that this was my only ambition, and that the glory of serving you was the only reward for which I looked'—(i. 202.)

In this spirit he toiled, lavished money, incurred danger, once even venturing to Paris to receive more minute instructions from the King and Queen than could be given by letter respecting negotiations with the different Powers whom Marie Antoinette was anxious to persuade to join in an 'armed congress,' in which alone she placed her hope of a re-establishment of her husband's authority. As she desired it, he laboured, entreated, and argued. Mercy doubted the practicability of the scheme; and we may probably on this point agree with the experienced statesman rather than with the despairing Queen or with her friend, too devoted even to doubt about what she proposed. But it is impossible to read a long memorial on the subject which he addressed to her in November 1791 without being struck by the general accuracy of his information, and the shrewd judgment with which he estimated the characters of the different statesmen of Europe, including our own Pitt.

With the year 1792 his journal recommences. It paints in lively colours the horror with which he regarded the atrocious events of the autumn and the murder of the King. Like all true Royalists, he now fixed all his wishes on saving the Queen; and it is not without pleasure we learn that the Prince of Wales had put himself in communication with some of the party, and expressed his eager desire to assist in any scheme that could be adapted to that end.

The correspondence is not continued beyond the death of the Queen. Soon afterwards M. de Fersen returned to Sweden, where he enjoyed the confidence of Gustavus Adolphus II. as fully as that of his father; but with the revolution which, in 1809, drove that prince from the throne, his influence passed away. He became, not unnaturally, an object of suspicion and hatred to the revolutionists, and in the strange insurrection of the next year he was brutally murdered by the populace.

Such outbreaks have seldom had a nobler victim; every line of his correspondence is an illustration of his gallant, disinterested character, as it is also among the most important contributions (second only in that point of view to the publications of M. Arneth and M. Feuillet de Conches) which have been made to that part of the history of the French Revolution which relates to the views and fate of the Royal Family.

*Memoir of the Rev. FRANCIS HODGSON, B.D., Scholar, Poet, and Divine, with numerous Letters from Lord Byron, and Letters by his Son, the Rev. JAMES J. HODGSON, M.A.* 2 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879.)

The subject of this memoir was, we imagine, in his poetical character  
VOL. VII.—NO. XIV. L L

the last survivor of the English bards whom, at the beginning of this century, Byron attacked, or, more rarely, eulogised, in his celebrated satire. Mr. Hodgson had the good fortune to be a subject of his praise. It was to him and Porson that, in the satirist's view, Cambridge was indebted for rescuing her in some degree from the imputation of being buried beneath a 'darkness' as 'universal' as stirred up Pope's indignation to the sarcasms of the *Dunciad*. Of Porson the poet had no special knowledge but that which connects the pupil and the teacher. But in Hodgson's case the praise, though well deserved, was probably dictated in some degree by personal acquaintance, first commenced in Byron's undergraduate days, and destined to ripen into an enduring friendship, which lasted to the end of the great poet. Byron's friendships, like the friendships of most men, were founded on various qualities, but his regard for Hodgson rested on the solid groundwork of confidence and respect. Mr. Hodgson was no time-serving favourite. He admired his friend, he loved his friend, but neither affection nor admiration ever restrained him from pressing on him the most energetic admonitions, at times the most uncompromising reproofs. And as he became intimately acquainted with all the members of Byron's family, it is an undeniable proof of his tact and judgment, as well as of the conviction of his sincerity and honesty with which he inspired all who came in contact with him, that both the poet's wife and sister regarded him with the most thorough esteem and good will. Indeed, to the last Mrs. Leigh corresponded with him whenever any fresh circumstance brought the mention of him she so faithfully loved to her recollection.

With Byron himself, too, his correspondence was so frequent, that a great part of the interest which the volumes before us excite is due to the unreserved display of the poet's character and feelings which his letters to his friend furnish; so that the work is no unimportant contribution to our Byronic literature. Hodgson even proposed, after his friend's death, to become his biographer—an intention which he most unfortunately relinquished in favour of Mr. Moore. We cannot doubt that he was far better qualified for the task; and that had he persevered in his first idea, though we should certainly have learnt far less of the biographer, we should have had a far more pleasing, as well as a far more lifelike picture of the poet himself.

The volumes before us are, however, far from being wholly occupied with Byron. Hodgson was a man of the most genial temper, and of a most multifarious acquaintance, equally at home with lords, poets, scholars, and divines, and even musical ladies. And we have letters from the Duke of Devonshire, Rogers, Moore, Butler, head-master of Shrewsbury, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, Lonsdale, Le Bas, and Mrs. Arkwright. But, though able to discuss their own subjects with them all, his passion was poetry. His letters to his most intimate friends were often in verse. And many of the specimens of his talent which his biographer gives us fully sustain the reputation which his published works earned for him. For he was a voluminous author. He was under thirty when he published the best poetical translation of Juvenal which our language possesses. And he followed it up by several original noeme



*Lady Jane Grey* and *The Friends* being those which at the time won the most favourable suffrages.

For above thirty years his life was passed in the discharge of the uneventful duties of a country parson, eking out a scanty income by taking pupils. But in 1836 he became somewhat more of a public character as Archdeacon of Derby; and in 1840, on the death of Dr. Goodall, who had been Provost of Eton for above thirty years, he was appointed to that office by the Minister, whom, in gratitude, we suppose, for that appreciation of his father's merits, the biographer calls 'the great Lord Melbourne'—an epithet certainly never before associated with his name. It was a most felicitous choice. Even those who remember with the most affectionate respect the stately figure and port of Dr. Goodall, every inch a Provost, will not deny that, though admirably fitted for his office by sound and extensive scholarship, set off by a manner which admirably combined courtesy with dignity, by a ready wit and a most liberal charity, he was somewhat too rigid in his adherence to old customs, too reluctant to believe that the system under which he himself had been trained in the eighteenth century, might not be altogether suited to the requirements of the nineteenth. But Hodgson was a reformer at heart, with a deep love for Eton, which was a sufficient security against reform in his hands becoming revolution. He was one of those few reformers who had distinct views of his own, not forced upon him by less judicious followers, and who knew when he had done enough. We could wish that of this the more important portion of his father's life, the biographer had given us a fuller notice than is contained in the two concluding chapters of his work. He enumerates indeed the 'introduction of the teaching of modern languages' as a part of the regular school work (ii. 263), the improvement and extension of the College buildings (ib. 278, 283), the restoration of the collegiate church (280), as he calls the chapel (280). But his chief enthusiasm is reserved for the abolition of Montem. Those of an older generation who remember the delight with which on every third Whit Tuesday hundreds and hundreds of old Etonians, not unaccompanied by wives, daughters, or sisters, collected in the school-yard to see the boys march in procession in front of the head-master, and accompanied them to Salt Hill in the morning, to the Terrace, or, in the present reign, to the playing-fields in the evening, will hardly agree with him that the innocent incongruities, and, as *Praed* calls it, 'no-meaning of Montem,' which the Sovereign, following in this the example of her grandfather and both her uncles, did not disdain to hail as a pleasing holiday, 'provoked the indignant condemnation of all sensible men'—(ii. 284.) The railroads, with the flood of cockneys, and worse than cockneys, wholly unconnected with Eton, which they brought down, had indeed made the maintenance of Montem impossible; but the facts admitted by himself, that, even as it was, the majority of the Fellows voted against its abolition, and that it was only reluctant assent which was wrung from the Queen, might have suggested to the biographer a little more gentleness in his strictures on the time-honoured, if somewhat unintelligible festival.

A son can hardly be an impartial biographer of his father; but even those unconnected with Provost Hodgson by blood will endorse the sentence in which the author sums up his character, and pronounces that 'his varied talents, agreeable and courteous manner, refined intellectual taste, genial, benevolent disposition, and sweet temper, formed together a winning combination which made him acceptable in every society'—(ii. 327.)

*Life of Anna Jameson.* By GERARDINE MACPHERSON. (London : Longmans and Co., 1878.)

THIS memoir of a gifted woman is by her niece and pupil, who did not live long enough to see her book in print. Anna Murphy, the eldest of the four daughters of a miniature-painter, was bred up in an atmosphere of art, and though her powers of drawing did not enable her to do more than make graceful etchings and characteristic vignettes, she had a wonderful appreciation of art, and wrote clear, flowing, and correct English. Thus she was eminently fitted to lead the way in that kind of literature that popularises art. Her four volumes of sacred and legendary art are the best introduction to the comprehension of the treasures of Italian and German galleries that we know. They do not presuppose too much knowledge in the reader, and are not too technical, and the legends were to many persons the first introduction to hagiology. The labour and research the collection must have cost must have been immense, and no pains were spared in making it as correct and complete as possible. It is the work by which the writer is chiefly known, though she also wrote *Characteristics of the Women of Shakespeare*, and several other works, of which the most useful was *Lectures on Sisters of Charity and on Communion of Labour*, which actual workers own as having greatly inspired and aided them. A letter from Miss Twining in the *Guardian* of December 18, ascribes much benefit to the suggestions of these writings, and to Mrs. Jameson's unfailing sympathy with good works. Indeed, her testimony to Sisterhoods of Mercy was the more valuable at the time she wrote, because it was a recognition of their value not coming from the Church party, and therefore the more independent and unsuspected, just as her *Lives of the Saints* won the attention of many who took them up merely as artistic mythology, and would never have touched them as religious examples. She was a kind of unconscious pioneer of the Church. Her own religion seems to have been somewhat eclectic. She had been taught in a dry way in her childhood by a governess who never gained her love. She thought dogma had been too much forced on her, and she thought for herself; but she must have had a deep fund of reverence, or she could not have dealt with sacred subjects as she has done. A most devoted and self-sacrificing daughter and sister, she was an unhappy wife, being one of the numerous literary ladies of the last generation who for one cause or another could not get on with their husbands, and as the biographers sincerely believe, entirely by the gentleman's fault—a question into which there is no occasion for us to enter.

*The Life and Letters of Dean Hook.* By the Rev. W. R. WOOD STEPHENS, M.A., Prebendary of Chichester. 2 vols. (London: Bentley and Son, 1878.)

THESE two valuable volumes have reached us at a date so near to that of our going to press that we can only give them a space very disproportionate to their real interest. This, however, is of the less moment, as we should hope that the mere announcement of them will be sufficient to secure them, from all our readers, that attention which their subject demands. Retired, as he had been, from public observation during the later years of his life, the part which Dr. Hook played in the great revival of Church feeling and Church work of the present century, was such as to secure him no common place in the history of our times. If Bishop Wilberforce set up a new ideal of Episcopal, so Dr. Hook set up a new standard of parochial activity, so far as our great towns were concerned. In these volumes of his son-in-law, Dr. Hook lives again, and, we should think, will long live. His somewhat quaint character, his sturdy honesty, his vigorous independence, his long struggle and final success at Leeds, and his peculiar geniality and humour, are all well displayed, and have been read by ourselves with hearty interest.

*The Life and Letters of Baroness Bunsen.* By A. J. C. HARE. 2 vols. (London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co.)

Two deeply interesting volumes, consisting *almost* exclusively of the letters of this truly remarkable woman. Differing widely, as we must, from the religious and theological specialities of her husband and herself, it is most pleasing to recognise the depth and reality of the religion which animated her whole singular and chequered career, while the number and variety of the topics touched upon in these letters give them a never-failing charm. It is the sort of book which would furnish materials for a long and interesting notice, had not all our space been more than fully occupied before it reached us.

1. *For Percival.* By MARGARET VELAY. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1878.)
2. *MacLeod of Dare.* By WILLIAM BLACK. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1878.)
3. *The First Violin.* (London: Bentley and Son, 1878.)

We have here classed together three novels as those which have for he past year been the chief attraction to the Magazines in which they have appeared, namely, the *Cornhill*, *Good Words*, and *Temple Bar*.

The last of the three is to our mind the most complete work of its kind in the sense of fitness for its place and purpose, that purpose being to provide mild excitement, and keep up interest and curiosity from month to month, claiming a certain amount of pleasurable admiration for the hero, but keeping below the line where the qualities become too high for this world's comfortable appreciation. The mystery as to who 'the First Violin' may be is cleverly kept in reserve, and his generosity and paternal affection make him thoroughly interesting, while his friend, Friedhelm, literally playing second fiddle, is so

loyally and undoubtingly constant to him, and so unshaken in confidence in his rectitude, as to make the story enjoyable. The drawback is the absolute negation of the religious side of life. The people are, and boast of being, mere 'children of this world,' prayerless, hopeless materialists, out of mere indifference to all but the interests of this life. The only religious person in the story is a melancholy countess, who is supposed to pass her time in reading Roman Catholic 'polemics;' and of the others, almost all the men, especially Friedhelm, have distinctly no religious belief at all. This might be accepted as the only too probable condition of the orchestra of a theatre in a little German town; but the heroine, an English clergyman's daughter, manifestly thinks them nothing the worse for it, and views Christmas-day as simply a time for family gatherings and amusements. She has left home to avoid an intolerable suitor whom she alone sees through; and her family are left utterly undeveloped, except the elder sister, who willingly sells herself to the undesirable baronet, and comes to misery and disgrace in consequence. Indeed the English characters are so inferior to the German, that we should think the book must be the work of a person who had lived so long abroad as to have nothing of home but ease in the use of the language. However, as we have said, it is a clever story, quite according to the promise of its Magazine, and thus giving the subscribers what they have a right to expect.

But we are obliged to say that we think families who take in *Good Words* ill-used by the insertion of such a story as *Macleod of Dare*. The periodical is freely given to young people and servants. Now we are far from saying that every book or paper we lend ought to be of our own way of thinking, and we have always thought Dr. Norman Macleod's original principle of inserting whatever is good and earnest of its kind a right one; but in several cases it has led to the acceptance of what is not good of its kind, only clever, and therefore the more mischievous. Mr. Black has two perfections—the description of scenery and the description of passion; and it is an evil sign of the times that the beauty of his pictures of scenery and the vigour of his writing is allowed to bear down all scruples as to its soundness and morality. *A Daughter of Heth* is the mere sport of circumstances, and on the very verge of ruin. In the *Three Feathers*, Wenna is for ever resolving the right and doing the wrong, yet we are called on to admire her. Even Bell, in the *Strange Adventures of a Phædon*, is encouraged in her inconstancy and ill-treatment of her honest English lover, and in *Madcap Violet*, the ungovernable temper and unchecked impulse lead to the overthrow of the intellect, as well as to utter desolation and despair. And 'Sir Keith Macleod' is, as he certainly tells us from the first, a Highland savage, as ferocious and revengeful at heart as ever were his ancestors. The tragic effect is increased by his surroundings—the noble old lady mother, who has lost all her sons on battle-fields, save this, her youngest—the sweet, generous-hearted cousin, and the devoted clan: the interest is sustained, and the word-painting wonderful; above all, the picture of the Western Isles covered with snow at sunrise. Keith, too, appears

at first so fine a creature that we feel it as piteous as it is in Hamlet to see his endowments like 'sweet bells jangled.' But it is neither fine nor manly to be so completely under the dominion of passion for an inferior being, as to brood on her and nothing else, until his mind falls into a morbid state, in which the hereditary ferocity of his Celtic nature gains the upper hand, and leads him to an atrocious and treacherous murder and suicide, all the more hauntingly horrible because only inferred from hints, not described. Now when we remember the tendency to plead as an excuse for everything—

'Thou knowest that Thou hast formed me  
With passions wild and strong'—

when we remember the sympathy shown in some instances by the crowd with murderers, as if being crossed in love were a plea for any desperate deed, we cannot but think such a novel as this utterly unjustifiable and demoralising. And, further, it is Mr. Black's own concern if he chooses to work out such a morbid study as how far civilisation is capable of prevailing over a Highlander's fiendish propensities to revenge; but the editor of *Good Words* is not justified in beguiling thousands of readers into dwelling on such an injurious contemplation, without knowing what they are coming to. It is like taking our children to see a museum and finding ourselves in La Morgue.

The other story we have named is of very different tone and tendency. It is not professedly a religious tale, but religion is its backbone, as it were, for its great *motif* is truth. Here things stand on their real merits. Truth is the one thing worth self-sacrifice; lying, revenge, and self-gratification sink into unutterable meanness. Percival, the hero, is ready to suffer anything so that he may preserve his integrity, and he does suffer severely. When a wild tomboy of a girl takes his good-natured patronage for love, and shows her feeling, his genuine dismay, though manifested only by his countenance and by his restraint of manner, leads the young lady to a revenge in which we are not taught to see anything glorious. In like manner, his uprightness and honour ruin his worldly prospects, and reduce him, an easy-going idler, to become a copying-clerk in a little country town. The central interest is, however, on Sissy Langton, a very sweet and winning creature, whose home is in the house of Mr. Thorne, grandfather to Percival and Horace. The former is the heir-at-law, but owing to an old quarrel, his father had been disinherited, and Horace had been regarded as the heir. A young lady, with whom Horace had been suspected of flirting, has an appointment with a brother in trouble, and asks Percival to take care of her on her way to the spot. On her account, Percival tells Sissy not to mention his having gone out of the grounds that evening. A farmer mistakes him for his cousin, whom he accuses to his grandfather of secret meetings with the young lady. Sissy is appealed to, and 'for Percival' utters her untruth, declaring that he had been with her all the evening. The ordinary heroine would think this a most venial transgression, if indeed she would view it as wrong at all; but Sissy is namelessly

unhappy and conscience-stricken from that moment, and pines so that no one understands her malady, while even her betrothal to Percival does her no good. By-and-by Percival finds out the reason why his cousin had lost the favour that he had gained. Of course he makes full explanation to his uncle, and, moreover, when Sissy confesses to him, there is a severity and sternness in his manner that make her feel so utterly base and unworthy that she shrinks away and breaks off her engagement, feeling the standard of Percival's mind above her reach.

Still all would have been made up, if at that very time a bank failure had not made Percival penniless, so that he would have felt it mercenary and dishonourable to approach her again. His grandfather dies suddenly without making any provision for him; Horace has the whole property, and Sissy, in her remorse, makes a will, the day she comes of age, leaving her 800*l.* a year to Percival. Poor child, ere many months are over, she is fatally injured by an accident. Percival is sent for, and as she lies dying, she implores him to accept her fortune. Then comes the truth, stern truth, once more. During this time, he had met the one woman who, seen for a moment, had been his ideal, before his engagement to Sissy. He cannot feel it honest to accept the bequest without letting her know that he is engaged to Judith Lisle. It is hard! The dying girl faints—Percival is banished from her room almost as a monster. He watches. A day and a night go by. People come and go. The vicar is casually mentioned among them. At last there is the call to the bedside—Sissy says, softly, 'My love to Miss Lisle,' and while giving the one sweet look of pardon, her mind sinks into the last unconscious murmurs about childish wanderings in the woods and fields, and all is soon over.

We cannot but ask, which story of these three is likely to leave the reader a better Christian?

*Records of a Girlhood.* By FRANCES ANNE KEMBLE. (London: Bentley and Son.)

THERE is even less occasion to enter on the delicate subject of conjugal difficulties in dealing with this book, since it concludes with Fanny Kemble's ill-starred marriage with Mr. Pierce Butler. It is in fact a compilation by her own hand from the letters and journals of her youth, beginning with her childish recollections, and going through her brief theatrical career. It is in the nature of things that such a record should be garrulous and gossiping, but it is full of interest, and the home portraits it gives are very striking, from their being so utterly different from preconceived notions of a theatrical family. The hard-working, practical, half-educated, but very clever mother wins our hearts, especially by her exceeding carefulness of her daughters and her quick intuitive clearness of judgment. The father, Charles Kemble, borne down by heavy difficulties and losses, and bravely struggling against them with gentlemanly uprightness and pathetic perseverance, comes out gallantly. Then we have the good maiden aunt, an actress herself for a short time, but much



happier in attending to her sister's children, and so tender-hearted even to fictitious woes that, though she daily chaperoned her niece Fanny to the theatre, she never but once saw her act. The elder brother, afterwards the celebrated Anglo-Saxon scholar, comes in occasionally with his friends of the élite of Cambridge, and we go along with the family anxieties when he shared in the Quixotic expedition to assist the Spanish constitutionalists, which was half-ludicrous, and wholly melancholy, in its results. And the younger brother makes one amusing appearance, when there was an attempt to make him Romeo to his sister's Juliet, and after rehearsing the part in a stolid school-boy tone, he celebrated his signal failure by a series of exulting cock-crowings. Good, conscientious people they all were. Theatrical talents were the inheritance of most, and therefore fixed their profession, and, when acting, they could not but be the persons they represented, at the cost of a terrible wear and tear of feeling. But strong religious feeling and high principle went along with the whole. Mrs. Kemble, as a Swiss, inherited much of Calvinistic strictness of training, and Fanny, though more catholic in sentiment, had much of the same grave self-control. Thus, at seventeen, she voluntarily gave up reading Byron, because of the sense of intoxication the poetry gave her. And though forced on the stage by family difficulties, the excitement acting caused her was the subject of conscientious scruples, and in after times she was far better satisfied to read than to act.

*The Directorium Anglicanum: being a Manual of Directions for the right Celebration of the Holy Communion, for the Saying of Matins and Evensong, and for the Performance of other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to Ancient Uses of the Church of England.* Fourth edition, carefully revised, with numerous emendations. Edited by the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L. (London: John Hogg and Co., 1879.)

It is about twenty years since the first edition of this work was published by the late Mr. Purchas, in an ornate and expensive form, and the issue of three entire editions of a work of this character sufficiently indicates the estimation in which it is held. The present edition is substantially the same as previous ones, though we notice a foot-note here and there. It is perhaps a pity that no reference is made to the eventful-history of Ritual since the issue of the third edition in 1866; so that the judgment in the Knightsbridge case is the latest event recorded in it. A second Appendix would have brought up the narrative to the present time.

*The Preacher's Storehouse: a Collection of Pithy Sayings and Choice Passages on Religious and Moral Subjects.* From the Works of Authors of various Ages and Countries. Alphabetically arranged. By the Rev. J. EDWARD VAUX, M.A., Joint Editor of *The Priest's Prayer-Book*. (London: G. J. Palmer.)

CLERGY who lack time for reading, or have no access to a good and constantly changing library, will find this book a profitable purchase.

It is compiled, however, on the most eclectic principle possible. Fathers and the mediæval writers jostle modern mystics, such as Novalis ; besides Thomas Reid, Thomas Carlyle, Spinoza, Dr. Johnson, Lady Blessington, and the *New Republic* (pp. 218, 219). And it must not be overlooked that the author's description of 'pithy sayings and choice passages' is no mere paraphrase. Some of the sayings are more pithy than pious, and must be intended to serve as 'awful examples' and *reductiones ad absurdum* of various prevalent modes of thought. They have all, however, the one quality of force in thought and expression, and will always administer a wholesome fillip to the reader's thoughts, often by direct and valuable suggestion, sometimes by the antagonism they will arouse.

*The Homiletic Quarterly*. Vol. II. (London: Richard D. Dickinson.)

THIS is a periodical which is devoted to the exposition of portions of the Holy Scripture and to the accumulation of matter suitable to be used in sermons. It opens its pages impartially to Churchmen and Dissenters; and indeed, as far as we can see, the Nonconformist divines occupy the larger share of its pages. The 'Clerical Symposium' seems on the whole dull; too diffuse and wordy, and not sufficiently vivid and forceful. But it is a praiseworthy publication with a praiseworthy aim, and will no doubt improve as it goes on.

*England's Inheritance in her Church; or, the Testimony of many Witnesses to the Value of the Church of England as the National Church.* Collated and arranged by the Rev. WILLIAM WEBB, B.A., Rector of Allhallows, Exeter. (London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.)

THIS is a *commonplace book* of the Disestablishment question; rather too long, but very useful nevertheless. It consists of quotations from sermons, speeches, leading articles, books, all bearing upon the advantages of an Established Church, and the real strength of its position, against any attacks but those of dishonesty or treason. It is a very useful lending-book, and the clergy will do well to have it.

*Our Established Church; its History, Philosophy, Advantages, and Claims (with a Dissertation on the Anglican Form of Ordination).* By the Rev. MORRIS FULLER, M.A., Rector of Lydford, and Incumbent of Princetown. (London: Pickering and Co.)

MR. MORRIS FULLER'S work is somewhat more ambitious. It aims to supply not merely the materials of a defence of the Church, but the defence itself, and it discusses the history, the advantages, the claims, and so on, of our Established Church; in every case intelligently and adequately, and yet with sufficient terseness. We have never seen the evidence for the validity of the Apostolic Commission in the Anglican Church better given; and the final chapter, 'Reasons for the Continuance of our Established Church,' is quite worth reprinting for more extensive circulation than a book can obtain. It deserves a most hearty commendation.

*Hearty Services: Ten Sermons.* By the Rev. J. G. NORTON. (London: W. W. Gardner.)

A GOOD word and hearty recommendation are due to these useful and vigorous sermons. They are the work of the vicar of a suburban parish in the city of Durham, of which the church, after long decay, has been recently restored, and it is the kind of book to be useful in the parish of any clergyman who is trying to revive an interest in Church matters. Vigorous common sense and genuine earnestness mark them throughout, and if we do not concur in some of the views put forward towards the end, we do not know that they will in any way detract from the book's usefulness.

*Mission Sermons for a Year.* By the Rev. H. WILMOT BUXTON, M.A. (London: Skeffington and Son.)

*The Future of the Human Race.* By the Rev. A. B. EVANS, D.D. (London: Skeffington and Son.)

*Village Homilies.* By the Rev. W. MILLER. (London: Skeffington and Son.)

EACH of these three volumes of sermons deserves mention.

As to the first, it seems almost inconsistent with the idea of a *Mission Sermon* to provide a series of such sermons for the course of the Christian Year, and yet, when we come to read them, we find the idea so well carried out that we cannot but hope the volume will be widely used. There is something so definite, striking, and even *piquant* in every sermon, that they cannot fail to be serviceable.

The second is a reprint, and a seasonable one, considering the recent decease of its gifted writer, whose many admirers will be glad to buy it as a memorial of him. Somewhat eccentric, alike in style and in matter, as he was, it is needless to criticise the peculiarities of these clever sermons. They remind us of their author alike in his strength and in his weakness.

The third is evidently the work of a beginner. Somewhat florid, and with a style which will improve as time goes on, these sermons give good promise of future usefulness. They must, we think, have been rather 'over the heads' of a village audience.

*The Poor Man's Best Friend.* By the Rev. F. E. WINSLOW, M.A. (London: Skeffington and Son.)

AN excellent book for parochial use; and in good bold clear type.

*The Christians and Moors of Spain.* By C. M. YONGE. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

AN exquisite piece of historical writing, and one which would instantly command attention at any time, but still more now that contemporary history draws so much attention to the subject of the Ottoman Empire.

*Literary Studies.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. Edited by R. H. HUTTON. 2 vols. (London: Longmans and Co.)

A GROUP of reviews and essays, not merely well worth reprinting, but

of such an altogether peculiar character of merit and perception, that, however little the writer would have cast in his lot with the *Church Quarterly Review*, we cannot but wish that they may be read by all our *clientèle*. Primarily an economist and financier, he was also a man of thorough culture and real thought, and such papers as those on Bishop Butler and the Emotion of Conviction, to say nothing of others on purely literary subjects, merit careful notice. The volume contains a pleasing memoir of the author by Mr. R. H. Hutton, and one by Mr. Bagehot of Mr. James Wilson, who died whilst acting as Financial Minister in India.

*Sinai from the Fourth Egyptian Dynasty to the Present Day.* By Major H. S. PALMER. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THIS is one of the excellent series of *Ancient History from the Monuments* which the venerable Society is now putting forth, and deserves to be widely read. Modest and succinct in form, it gives the results of large investigation and of much independent study and thought.

#### AMERICAN THEOLOGY.

A PACKET of books from New York has reached us which seem worthy of notice, both primarily in themselves, and further, in respect of the exceedingly low prices at which Messrs. Whittaker are publishing works intended to be useful in the religious education of their countrymen. We hope the evil of high-priced books is gradually being remedied among ourselves; but it *is* an evil unquestionably still.

*The Valley of the Shadow* contains eight sermons on the 'Doctrine of Future Punishment,' by Dr. C. H. Hall, which were preached at Brooklyn during the excitement caused among our Transatlantic brethren by Dr. Farrar's sermons on that subject. They are vigorous, clear, and pointed in language, and although occasionally words and opinions startle us with their free and independent—shall we say self-conceit?—we lay them down with a strong sense of respect for the writer, and thankfulness for the Divine reverence and belief which prevents his dogmatising, or professing to speak with rule and line demonstrations on these awful subjects, so wrapped in mystery by God's providence. S. Augustine meets with scant courtesy, save, indeed, that he is somewhat patronised by his New-World reader; and when Dr. Hall tells us that he does not hold the Prayer-Book to be infallible, we are inclined to ask who does? And to what end such a remark is made?

*The Social Law of God*, by Dr. Lashburn, contains sermons on the Ten Commandments, of which those on 'the Law of the Household,' 'Social Purity,' and 'Social Honesty,' strike us as admirable in their handling their subjects from the practical, nineteenth-century point of view; and we wish that at home our preachers would oftener drive wholesome truths like these into their people's ears. The earlier sermons, touching on worship, &c., are less satisfactory, and betray an ignorance of true sacramental doctrine which altogether mars

their usefulness, and would cause many readers to throw them aside at once.

Four short manuals, from the pen of the Rev. G. Shuin, of Newton, Mass., contain some very useful matter, which may have more weight among some English readers, thanks to the freshness of their 'Transatlantic word-clothing,' than the more stereotyped books they are accustomed to.

I. *A Manual of Instruction for Confirmation Classes* has a great deal of excellent practical teaching. See Chapters iv. and vi., on 'Special Seasons, and Home Piety,' bringing to bear the dogmatic teaching given upon everyday life.

II. *A Manual of Church History* is well drawn up, and on the whole is moderate and fair in its dealings with the Reformation, the Jesuits, Ultramontaniam, &c. The chapter called 'Since the Reformation' is interesting, and well written.

III. *A Manual of Instruction on the Prayer-Book* is interesting, from its bearing upon the Church's progress in America, and some of our English parochial readers may learn to value it and its Prayer-Book more when seen through others' glasses.

IV. *Questions about our Church* is a little book intended for those outside the Church, who may be turning over in their minds the desirableness of joining her, and though not taking quite the highest ground possible, might be found very useful among Dissenters.

Each member of the whole batch will be likely, after its several fashion, to prove a useful addition to the parish tables of the parochial clergy.

## THE RETROSPECT OF 1878.

### I.

DEATH has been so much more busy with remarkable men abroad than has been the case at home that, contrary to our usual custom, we will commence our Annual Retrospect with the foreign rather than the domestic obituary.

Scarcely had the year opened when the new Kingdom of Italy lost, first, its most distinguished military commander, the General La Marmora, familiar to all who remember the days of the Crimean War as having led the Italian Contingent which joined the English and French forces before Sebastopol, and a few days afterwards, at the moderate age of fifty-eight, the first King of the modern kingdom of Italy, Victor Emmanuel, who died January 9. Then, within a month, at the age of eighty-five, and after a pontificate of thirty-one years, passed away the spiritual potentate, who had so long and so obstinately confronted the new King, Pope Pius the Ninth; and almost immediately after him, the famous Jesuit astronomer and savant, Padre Secchi. But it has not only been in Italy that the

year 1878 has taken away the leading ecclesiastical characters. Early in October died Bishop Doupanloup, the ablest of French Bishops; and on October 24, Cardinal Cullen, aged 78, who had long directed the policy of the Roman Church in Ireland. Seldom, indeed, has a single year seen the departure of such a group of men, who had exercised so large an influence in such extensive spheres of action.

At home our greatest loss has been that of Bishop Selwyn, the great founder and organiser of the New Zealand Church, and whose Lichfield Episcopate, if not equally brilliant, was at least not unappreciated by those among whom he laboured with an untiring and unrelenting devotion, which left him no time or energy for work beyond his immediate diocese. The extraordinary demonstration of respect at his funeral in Lichfield ought to be chronicled, as showing that faithful labours, such as his, do not fail of their due estimation. To our human judgment, his removal was painfully inopportune, being just before the commencement of the second Congress of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, in which he would have been the one great link between the Bishops of all its several branches. It is somewhat singular that his Episcopate at Lichfield exactly filled up the space between the first and second of these important gatherings. He died April 11, and was the only Diocesan Bishop of the Church in England who died during 1878. But October removed from us the first of the revived Suffragan Bishops, Bishop Mackenzie, of Nottingham; and Ireland has lost the Bishop of Cork, Dr. Gregg.

Supreme in his own way as Bishop Selwyn had been, perhaps an almost equally deep, though, of course, far less wide-spread feeling was excited at the death, on January 4, of Professor Mozley, whose general reputation had been lately so much increased by the publication of the now well-known volume of *University Sermons*, and the same month took away Mr. George Williams, vicar of Ringwood, best known through his keen interest in the affairs of the Eastern Church, and his long residence at Cambridge as Fellow of King's College.

Church architecture has lost Sir Gilbert Scott, whose fortune it had been to have superintended the 'restoration' of nearly every English Cathedral, to say nothing of churches innumerable either built or restored, so that whatever else may have to be said of him it is certain that no other individual man has left so strong a mark upon the fabrics of the English Church. It should be added that he was the architect selected, after a European competition, to build the Hamburg Cathedral, after the great fire in that city of about forty years ago.

Other ecclesiastical names which deserve commemoration are those of Dr. Saunders, for five-and-twenty years Dean of Peterborough, a name deeply honoured by the elder among us, but for the last few years little heard of through failing health; Dean Llewellyn, of S. David's; Dr. Jenkyns, Canon of Durham, and for many years Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham, and whose lectures in the first days of that University attracted so many Divinity students to it; Dr. Symons, ex-Warden of Wadham College, a face



and figure long familiar to Oxford men ; Mr. Wood Warter, of West Tarring, son-in-law to Robert Southey, and editor of his *Remains* ; and Dr. A. B. Evans, Vicar of St. Mary-le-Strand, whose able, though somewhat singular sermons attracted so many hearers.

The Royal family has been invaded during the past year by the death of the ex-King of Hanover, the Duke of Cumberland, in June, and more recently, on December 14, the anniversary of her father's death, by that of the deeply lamented Princess Alice, Grand-Duchess of Hesse-Darmstadt.

The roll of political characters remains comparatively intact—Lord Russell, who died May 28, at the age of 85½, being rather a survival of an earlier era than a political name of the present, and Mr. Russell Gurney, however respected both in and out of the House, having hardly been a political character, although his name will be long associated with Parliamentary proceedings in connexion with the already decaying fabric of the Public Worship Regulation Act. In like manner it may be said that the death of Lord Chelmsford, though it removes one who had been a Cabinet Minister, scarcely removes a politician or a statesman. And Mr. Whalley, though emphatically a Parliamentary, was certainly not a political character. Art has lost Sir F. Grant ; Ægyptology, Mr. Bonomi ; and Literature, Mr. G. H. Lewes.

This obituary of the year may, perhaps, be fitly closed with a mention of the chief ecclesiastical appointments, which are as follows :—(1) That of Dr. Maclagan, well known through his work at Newington and Kensington, to succeed Bishop Selwyn at Lichfield ; (2), of Professor Perowne, to the Deanery of Peterborough ; (3) of Canon Allen, to the Deanery of S. David's—an appointment most natural and most deserved ; and (4) that of Mr. Ernest Wilberforce, to the difficult post of the chief of the Mission scheme devised as the memorial to his father, Bishop Wilberforce, and therewith to the Canonry at Winchester, vacant by the death of Canon Woodroffe. This appropriation of a canonry to the promotion of a great diocesan work is in itself a sign of the times, and deserves to be chronicled, and it is to be hoped that the success of the undertaking may be commensurate with the needs which exist for it in the populous centres in which the Mission is intended to labour.

The retirement of the Earl of Chichester from the Ecclesiastical Commission, and the appointment of the Earl of Stanhope in his place, should also be mentioned, and also Bishop Baring's resignation of the see of Durham. At the moment of writing his successor has not been appointed.

## II.

The events of the year have been so almost entirely political, that its ecclesiastical history has been comparatively unimportant ; and considering that, above all things, the Church at the present moment needs rest and quiet to pursue her course of *leavening* the nation and winning back the masses of the population who have grown up outside her influence, this is not to be regretted. Still the year has had

its ecclesiastical events, although they have rather been such as to be the seeds of things to come than matters of immediate results.

First and foremost should be named the passing of the Additional Bishoprics Bill, which passed its third reading on August 14, thanks to the pertinacity of the Home Secretary, Mr. Cross, whose services in this particular ought to be more widely known and appreciated than, we fear, they are. More than thirty years have now passed since the agitation for this moderate increase of the Episcopate commenced, and if on the one hand it is somewhat discouraging to see how hard it is for the Church to obtain the permission to spend her own members' money in properly equipping herself for her duties towards the nation, still, on the other hand, it is a testimony to the value of unlimited perseverance. Thus far the nineteenth century has added the sees of Ripon, Manchester, Truro, and St. Alban's to the roll of Bishoprics as they stood at the close of Henry VIII.'s strange and eventful reign; and the Act of 1878 has rendered possible the addition of sees at Liverpool, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and Southwell—an achievement which, if only an instalment of what is needed, is still of the most hopeful augury. We have always held that the career of Bishop Longley in the diocese of Ripon furnishes the highest example of the good done by the subdivision of our huge dioceses. The Church in that part of Yorkshire was almost created during the years of his Episcopate, and we were glad to see in a number of the *Quarterly Review* of last year some sketch of what was then accomplished: a real, though tardy acknowledgment. The new diocese of Truro appears likely to be about to furnish such another example, and perhaps ere long we may ourselves undertake an account of the prompt and vigorous manner in which its organisation has been effected, and of the work which is being already accomplished. Let us hope that the fortunes of the new sees of Newcastle-on-Tyne and Liverpool, where the need is at least as great as it was in Cornwall, may be as happy as those of Truro.

Next after this extension of the Episcopate, though widely differing from it, the most important of purely home-church matters has been the still further collapse of the unfortunate and ill-starred Public Worship Regulation Act. Its inception set the Church by the ears, its operation has been not so much to rend the Church, as at first was feared, but rather to set the lawyers by the ears. On the whole, the Bishops have shown a wholesome dread of using so dangerous a weapon; and in the very few cases in which it has been employed, the issue has been to array judge against judge and court against court. It is needless here to do more than to refer to the not very edifying way in which we have seen the highest legal authorities belabouring each other in reference to ecclesiastical proceedings. The Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, the Chief Baron, and Lord Penzance have all been involved, and some at least of them have seemed as if they were bent on showing that the legal mind, the legal pen, and the legal tongue could outdo the proverbial bitterness of the *odium theologicum*. What the issue of it all may be time only can show, but, at all events, thus much is clear—the unhandy Public

Worship Regulation Act is hopelessly discredited; our miserably disorganised system of Ecclesiastical Courts is seen to be what Churchmen have always considered it, and Churchmen need only time and patience to secure some more wholesome state of things in its room. *Everything comes to him who knows how to wait.* The present *dead-lock* is educating such of the laity as can learn, faster and better than any words of ours could do it, and it does not need much faith to be convinced that there is a Power which out of this permitted chaos will in His own time elicit the wished-for Kosmos. Let any Churchman contrast the feelings with which we were looking upon things at the opening of 1876 with those at the opening of 1879, and we feel that gratitude and hope must predominate. It is true that the 'Living Voice' of the Church has not yet found its fully developed organ, but it is a serious question whether as yet we are ripe for its bestowal. Meanwhile, the dioceses are gradually organising themselves; the informal and somewhat irregular Diocesan Conferences are bringing laity and clergy into wholesome contact, and teaching them, if not to act together, at least to understand each other; they are quickening the perception of diocesan unity, and it cannot be long before, from out of their tentative and local efforts, *some* mode of central action on the part of the Church at large, in which the spirituality and the laity can combine with good effect must be developed. The course of the Church Revival has been eminently encouraging: *first*, the revival of parochial Church life, which may be considered as accomplished; *next*, that of Diocesan life, in the mid-process of which we now stand; *thirdly*, that of the central and combined action of the whole Church, towards which we are dimly but certainly advancing.

### III.

But by far the most striking event of the year was the second LAMBETH CONFERENCE, which was attended by exactly *one hundred* Bishops of the Anglican Communion, namely, the *two* English Archbishops, and *twenty-six* English Diocesan Bishops, and *three* Suffragans, the *two* Irish Archbishops, and *seven* Irish Bishops; *seven* Scottish Bishops; *seventeen* Bishops from the United States, and *two* American Missionary Bishops, together with *thirty* acting and *four* retired English Colonial Bishops.

The proceedings were private, so far as the actual discussions were concerned, and this was at the special desire of some, particularly American Bishops, though with the concurrence of all; but we cannot help thinking that on another occasion it may be wiser to have a brief account of each day's proceedings prepared and published, not so much with the view of satisfying mere curiosity, as with that of protecting the Conference from misconception, as otherwise incorrect accounts ooze out which, however misleading, it is impossible to correct. Thus some by no means satisfactory reports did get into the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and every one remembers that in 1867 the *Guardian* in like manner had its own accounts of discussions.

With respect to its REPORTS, the first and second were of the most

general importance, as they laid down principles affecting the inter-communion of all the variously circumstanced Anglican Churches. Some change of feeling is apparent since the 1867 Conference in this respect. At that time, partly from the difficulties in the Colenso case, and from an unwillingness on the part of some to recognise the independent authority of the provincial action of Colonial Churches, there was a tendency towards centralisation.<sup>1</sup> This time the truer principle of the liberty and rights of the different Churches of our Communion, when formed into provinces, was much more distinctly recognised, and the fact of variety not being inconsistent with genuine organic unity was more distinctly perceived.

At the same time the necessity, which the Church in all ages has acknowledged, of united counsels for the purpose of preserving harmony, alike in principle and in action, was not only confessed, but the gradual development of these Episcopal Conferences into a more truly and definitely representative form is clearly pointed to as the safest solution of the difficulties of the question. The results of this last Conference, as compared with that of 1867, mark a real growth of opinion in this direction, and are hopeful and encouraging. Certainly there has never since primitive times been so distinct a proof given to the world of the fact that the true unity of the Church requires no visible centre either for its manifestation or for its exercise.

The last Report of the series was that respecting which at the time most anxiety was felt, since under its very general heading questions might have been introduced, and some actually were introduced, of the utmost difficulty and importance, and respecting which there were sure to be the greatest differences of opinion, and this without any notice being given of them, and without any consent of the Conference itself to their introduction. Happily, through the wisdom and moderation which, under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, directed its counsels, this was not the cause of any disunion, though at one time a division seemed inevitable. But we trust that the experience of the 1878 Conference will prevent the repetition of the perilous experiment. Indeed, the first Report, which refers to the action of future Conferences, suggests a method for the previous choice and arrangement of subjects for discussion which will obviate this danger. The mistake on the last occasion was that a scheme of subjects was prepared by a committee of English Bishops, without any consultation with Bishops of the other Churches, or at least without any power being given to them to introduce subjects. And this scheme was consequently made so vague, especially under its last heading, that almost *anything* might, at the will of the Committee, have been brought in under its terms, without any notice at all.

Among the very important questions introduced under this head was the relation of the Anglican Communion towards the Old Catholic Body, and the practical method to be adopted for aiding it. This is

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the difference between the 1867 Report on Central Court of Appeal, which was due in great measure to the influence of Bishops Wilberforce, Selwyn, and Gray, and the Second Report of 1878.

clearly a question not merely of such abounding interest, but involving such fundamental principles of Church order, that it ought surely to have had a carefully digested Report to itself, instead of being left to be worked out in its application and details to the Prelates selected for that purpose.

## IV.

The meeting of the Lambeth Conference leads naturally to the subject of our Colonial and Missionary Churches. It wants still five years before our foreign Episcopate will have completed the first century of its existence; and if its rate of increase was for very many years so slow as to be nearly imperceptible, of late it has been, perhaps, as rapid as is desirable. The Resolutions of the Conference, if only they are loyally followed, or can be enforced where such loyalty does not yet exist, will do much to consolidate and harmonise these growing Churches, of which scarcely any two are in precisely the same stage of development. We confess that we look with some anxiety to the prospect of the Lambeth Resolutions being quietly ignored in certain quarters.

What has been called a 'passion for organisation' is but a synonym for that system by which individual Churches, each instinct with life, and possessed by a keen sense of its necessities, are bound together, and find in such organisation and union their surest defence against secularism in its many forms. It is idle, *e.g.* to boast of our entire sympathy and full communion with the sister Church of the United States, when we sanction a duplicate organisation and a duplicate Episcopate in the same place. We have always regretted to find American and English congregations placed side by side and yet separate, and liable, but for the good feeling of persons concerned, to be more pointedly separate in Paris or in Rome; but the evil of this is magnified when it comes to separate missions to the heathen, each with its own Bishop at its head. We are thinking at this moment of Japan, where the American Church has had a mission with a Bishop at its head for some dozen years. Five years ago, on the appointment of a Bishop of Victoria—the third occupant of that see—the Primate added to his charge—for a diocese in the strict sense of the word does not exist—all British subjects, members of the Church of England, in Japan, distant from Hong Kong 1,500 miles. The Bishop can only visit Japan triennially, and on those occasions his ignorance of the vernacular must limit his efficient ministrations to the handful of English who form the congregation of the Legation chaplain, and at the same time removes him from his proper duties in China. The clergy in Japan, meanwhile, are, with the single exception of the Legation chaplain, missionaries to the heathen; they form three distinct bodies, the Americans, the Church Missionary Society clergy, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel clergy. The first-named have their own Bishop, an accomplished Japanese scholar, always with them; the last-named have been placed under the American Bishop, save in the few weeks of the English Bishop's triennial visit; the Church Missionary Society's clergy are,

except for the same period, autocephalous, or are governed from Salisbury Square. Such an arrangement, or, more strictly, defiance of all arrangement, loudly called for action from the assembled Prelates, and the Resolution declaring it to be 'most undesirable that either Church should for the future send a Bishop or missionaries to a town or district already occupied by a Bishop of another branch of the Anglican Communion' entirely satisfies us; but we repeat our hope that it will be loyally accepted, and, where necessary, enforced. We have noticed with surprise that, since the Lambeth Conference was held, the Bishop of Mauritius has gone, at the request of the Church Missionary Society, and held a Visitation of that Society's Missions at Mombas, which is close to Bishop Steere's head-quarters. Mombas is a very old mission of the Church Missionary Society, and no Bishop of Mauritius, with whose diocese it can have no connexion, has ever visited it before. No one claims territorial jurisdiction for Bishop Steere in the sense in which it is secured to a Bishop in England, but there is a law, higher than letters-patent, which should regulate these things.

In short, Society Bishops are bad in principle, and we hope the race will not be increased; but we hear with some concern that the ill-sounding 'Jerusalem Bishopric Act' is likely to be used for purposes not contemplated by those who passed it, and will provide for the consecration of more Society Bishops in India and other countries.

The changes in the Colonial Churches have been few during the past year. On the festival of the Purification the Rev. H. B. Bousfield was consecrated Bishop of Victoria, and has bravely gone out with wife and family to find his diocese the scene of war, and desolated by drought and famine. On S. Philip and S. James', Dr. L. Jones was consecrated Bishop of Newfoundland, and has justified the action of those who selected him, by a fourteen weeks' visitation by sea, in which he was compared by all who came in contact with him not unfavourably with Bishop Feild. On S. John Baptist's Day Dr. Roberts was consecrated Bishop of Nassau, in succession to the beloved Bishop Venables, and the long-hoped-for diocese of North Queensland received a Bishop in the person of Dr. Stanton, who, we learn with regret, took the oath of canonical obedience to Canterbury.

Bishop Oxenden has exchanged the see of Montreal for the chaplaincy of Cannes, and the election of his successor, Dean Bond, has shaken the faith of the most enthusiastic believers in the principle of popular election. The office of Metropolitan is no longer tied to the see of Montreal, neither does it attach itself, as in New Zealand and in the United States, to the senior prelate of the province. In Canada it is to be a matter of election on each vacancy. On the present occasion we hope to see both principles combined, and that the free choice of the Bishops will lighten the venerable Bishop of Fredericton, whose consecration took place in 1845, and who is the sole survivor of his contemporaries of that date.

The 'Tinnevely movement,' as the remarkable accessions of inquirers and catechumens in Southern India have for brevity's sake been described, continues, but in reduced volume. Between 30,000



and 40,000 persons have voluntarily submitted themselves to Christian teaching, and Bishop Caldwell asserts of them that so far the new converts are, spiritually and intellectually, 'superior to the old.' A similar movement, but on a smaller scale, has taken place in Ahmednuggur, in the diocese of Bombay.

In Madagascar we have observed with much interest a great step that has been made by the Rev. F. A. Gregory, son of the Rev. R. Gregory, Canon of S. Paul's. At a place called Ambatoharanana, a day's journey from the capital, Mr. Gregory has established a theological college, to which he has admitted by competitive examination seven out of fifteen Malagasy candidates for theological training. Their curriculum embraces Pearson *On the Creed* (which Mr. Gregory has translated), practical and dogmatic theology, Church history, and other subjects, secular and sacred. A quantity of subjects, which has proved a snare to the youth of Madagascar in previous efforts made for their instruction and advancement, has wisely been avoided.

The real progress of the Church's work abroad is often hindered by the complacent optimism of its friends; we desire to avoid this pitfall, and to record our conviction that the cause of the Church is suffering both from the lack and from the abundance of the men whom England sends out to the very hardest work which man can be called upon to do. Work abroad demands the very best men that our highest culture at home can produce; and of this sort, missionary work has very few labourers. The Cambridge Mission to Delhi, in connexion with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, is a capital specimen of what the *personnel* of a Mission should be; but well-meaning people, who see in every lad who sings in choir or teaches in the Sunday School an embryo missionary, and who never rest until he has been trained and sent abroad at a cost of some 400*l.* or 500*l.* of charitable monies, have a good deal to answer for in respect of our failures. A few very good men will do more than a host of indifferent and half-educated persons; the latter are doomed to mediocrity if not to absolute failure; the former will disregard present small results in comparison with larger results of the future, and in preparing an indigenous ministry, they are securing the ultimate independence of the Church. Thus it is that the work of Bishop Selwyn is still bearing fruit in New Zealand, five Maoris having been ordained within the past year. So it will be, we hope, that from Mr. Gregory's College in Madagascar, those parts of the Island will be evangelised which have invited the Church to come to them, but which there is not yet strength to occupy.

The acquisition of Cyprus, to which island the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has within the last few days sent a clergyman, may perhaps afford a base of operations for work among the Moslem population in the East, and may also be a link with the efforts being made for the benefit of the so-called Nestorians of Armenia. From the Cape we get news of Dr. J. M. Arnold's work among the Moslems, which is as encouraging as it is unusual, for Mohammedanism does not at present pose itself in an attitude of humble inquiry and docility.

## V.

The extent to which the subject of clergy supply has occupied the attention of Churchmen of late years appears to make it desirable that we should henceforward give, year by year, the accurate numbers of the newly-ordained. A year ago, the following calculation appeared in the *Guardian* newspaper respecting the number of new clergy annually required to maintain the staff of clergy at its proper strength :—

Number required to supply death vacancies . . .	460
"          "          "          new posts . . .	200
Total annually required . . .	660

As matter of fact, the number of deacons ordained during 1878 was 661, the numbers at the several periods of Ordination being as under :—

Lent . . . . .	66
Trinity . . . . .	256
September . . . . .	112
Christmas . . . . .	227
Total . . . . .	661

It may also be worth while to give the numbers for a few preceding years. They are as follows :—

1873	Number of Deacons ordained	630
1874	"          "          "	644
1875	"          "          "	590
1876	"          "          "	600
1877	"          "          "	697
1878	"          "          "	661

But, inasmuch as it may be said that what is really wanted is to know the number, not merely of deacons, but of those who in each year go forward to the priesthood, we will add the corresponding numbers of those ordained priests in the several years :—

1874	Number of Priests ordained	624
1875	"          "          "	605
1876	"          "          "	548
1877	"          "          "	632
1878	"          "          "	664

From which it appears that we have more than recovered from the striking diminution in the numbers of candidates for Orders which followed the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act, and that the number is now fully equal to the calculated number required to fill, not merely the death vacancies, but also the new posts. We are indebted for these figures to the Rev. H. T. Armfield, of Salisbury.

## THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND AND THE ARTICLE ON IRVINGISM.

WE have received the following letter from the Duke of Northumberland in reference to the article in our last number, entitled 'The History and Doctrines of Irvingism.'

We print it as we have received it, but in so doing we feel bound to make our strongest protest against such expressions as 'lie,' 'fabrications,' 'gross and malignant falsehood,' and 'hypocritical affectation,' of which the three first quoted are employed in a context which leads to the inference that the writer of the letter assumes the contributor to have been himself the fabricator, and of which the fourth can only be applied to him.

However much the Duke of Northumberland may have regretted the publication of the statements in question, and disbelieved their accuracy, he was bound to have given credit to the author of the article and to the Review which published it for a *bona fide* conviction of their truth. It is, we trust, totally needless to add our sincere regret that the statements should have given pain to any one living, especially to the relatives of a lady who was spoken of exclusively as an historical character.

'To the Editor of the "Church Quarterly Review."

'Alnwick Castle, Nov. 1st, 1878.

'SIR,—Certain falsehoods affecting the memory of the late Lady Harriet Drummond having appeared in an article in the last number of the *Church Quarterly Review*, headed "History and Doctrines of Irvingism" (pages 50 and 51), I trust that you will see the propriety of giving publicity in your next number to my peremptory and emphatic denial of the truth of these fabrications.

'The first of them has, indeed, this minimum of fact for its foundation, that Lady Harriet did suffer, on the occasion alluded to, from a malady, the nature of which was mistaken by her physician; but the whole account of the "expectation of the birth of Elias," "the lying in state," &c. &c., is a gross and malignant falsehood, not improved, in my opinion, by the hypocritical affectation of reluctance on the part of the narrator to "violate the sanctities of private life."

'Of the other story given in the footnote, I will only observe that, though it cannot be more untrue than the first, it is absolutely baseless, with the additional merit of having been fastened successively on two other victims by persons assuming authority equally *unimpeachable* for the lie.

'The utter disregard shown for the feelings of the children by whom Lady Harriet's memory is loved and hallowed, is the more cruel and offensive, that these inventions can have no bearing on the truth or falsehood of the tenets which the author of the article desires

to refute in his review of the work *misnamed* the "History and Doctrines of Irvingism."—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) 'NORTHUMBERLAND.'

Immediately on the receipt of the foregoing, we communicated it to the writer of the article, from whose rejoinder we print the following:—

'My information comes from one who was resident at Albury at the time, and who, for some years before and after, was a member of a leading Irvingite family, living on the most intimate terms with Mr. Drummond and the other members of the community.

'I have never known a shrewder or more sensible person, or one on the accuracy of whose deliberate statements of what *she herself had seen and heard* I could more implicitly rely. Since writing the article I have seen another lady who was present on the same occasion, which I will not call a "lying in state," if that is objected to, but a reception, and who has a most vivid recollection of all the circumstances.

'She fully corroborates all that I have written, and could supply many additional particulars.

'The "expectation of Elias" was, I have been informed, perfectly notorious among the whole Irvingite community at Albury. They had been for some months previously in a state of excitement on the subject, which rose to fever heat when the arrival of the doctor's carriage was made known, and the subsequent collapse was in proportion. The doctor is now dead.

'I cannot at all agree with his Grace that these *inventions*, as he terms them, have no bearing on the truth or falsehood of the tenets of the Irvingites. It seems to me, on the contrary, that they are very important as showing the real character of their pretensions to prophetic and miraculous gifts, and it is only on that ground that I have been induced to record them.'

Our contributor says the same in regard to the story contained in the foot-note.

It appears to us that additional comment on our part is needless, unless indeed it be to repeat that we should not have published the impugned statements had we not been convinced of their very real and definite bearing on the argument of the article.

P.S.—Having obtained the further information which is contained in the above paragraphs, we submitted them in proof to the Duke of Northumberland, in the hope that he, of whose perfect sincerity of conviction we have no doubt, would on his side have withdrawn the imputations on our *bona fides*, which is as precious to us as the reputation for sober sense of his relatives is to him, and would have assisted us in investigating statements in which we are as much interested as the Duke in probing to the uttermost. We have, in reply, only received another letter from the Duke, reiterating in the same terms the charge contained in his first communication; so that here we leave the subject.

The allegations refer to matters of fact on which either side considers that it possesses evidence proving the other to be under a mistake, and upon which we are chiefly concerned in maintaining our own *bona fides*. Upon the subject-matter of the allegations, we have been able, by the assistance of our contributor, to furnish evidence, which, until it is rebutted, must be admitted in justification of their accuracy. We offered to the other side the opportunity of rebutting these definite statements, but it has preferred merely to meet them by strong language.

---

*Erratum.*

*On page 285, in line 11, an Act of Queen Elizabeth is named as of the year 1570. It should have been 1571.*

It is a well-known fact that the medical profession in this country has been the subject of much criticism and attack in recent years. This is due to many causes, but one of the most important is the fact that the medical profession has been slow to adopt the new methods of treatment and diagnosis which have been developed in other countries. This has led to a loss of confidence in the medical profession on the part of the public, and has resulted in a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the medical profession as a whole.

On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that the medical profession in this country has been the subject of much criticism and attack in recent years. This is due to many causes, but one of the most important is the fact that the medical profession has been slow to adopt the new methods of treatment and diagnosis which have been developed in other countries. This has led to a loss of confidence in the medical profession on the part of the public, and has resulted in a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the medical profession as a whole.



# INDEX TO VOLUME VII.

## ADA

- A**DAMNAN, his account of S. Columba and the monastery of Iona, 165 *sq.*  
 Adams, Rev. H. C.: *Wykehamica: a History of Winchester College and Commoners*, 493  
 Ælfric, Abp., Anglo-Saxon Easter Homily of, cited, 296  
 Affleck, W., his translation of Paul Janet's *Final Causes*, with Preface by Dr. R. Flint, 485  
 Ambrose, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 21; on Luke xxii. 31, 27; on John xxi. 15-17, 28, 30  
 American Theology, 512 *sq.*  
 Ashley, Rev. J. M.: *Origen the Preacher*, 258  
 Atkinson, F.: *Resurrection and other Poems*, 258  
 Atwell, Dr. W. E.: *The Pauline Theory of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, 472  
 Augustine, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 23; on Luke xxii. 31, 28; on John xxi. 15-17, 29, 31  
 Awdry, F.: *Sketch of Anne Mackenzie and her Brother the Missionary Bishop*, 258

- B**AGSTER'S *Septuagint Version of the Old Testament*, &c., 469  
 Balgarnie, Mr. R.: *Life of Sir Titus Salt*, 254 *sq.*  
 Basil the Great, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 21; on Luke xxii. 31, 27; on John xxi. 15-17, 29  
 Baxter, R., Irvingite prophet, 46 *sq.*, 50  
 Bede, Venerable, on Matt. xvi. 18, 24; on John xxi. 15-17, 29

## CAR

- Black, Mr. W.: *MacLeod of Dare*, 505  
 Blunt, Rev. J. H., his *Annotated Bible*, &c., 466  
 Boulter, Abp., 109, 113  
 Bramhall, Abp., re-ordinations by, 288; on Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, 299  
 Bristol, Earl of, his correspondence with Bp. Gauden on *Icon Basilikè*, 342  
 Browne, Dr. J.: *Life of John Eadie*, 253 *sq.*  
 Browning, Mr., his Poems, 65-92  
 Burke, Edmund, on Protestantism, 268 *sq.*; on the Coronation Oath, 272  
 Burnet, Bp., on the authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 353  
 Buxton, Rev. H. W.: *Mission Sermons for a Year*, 511

- C**AHIER, Rev. P. C.: *Nouveaux Mélanges d'Archéologie, d'Histoire et de Littérature sur le Moyen-Âge*, 248 *sq.*  
 Campbell, Mary, her pretended gift of tongues, 42 *sq.*  
 Candida Casa, church of, 150 *sqq.*, 158  
 Cardale, Miss, her pretended gift of tongues, 46, 49  
 Cardale, J. B., Pillar-Apostle of Irvingism, 36 *sq.*; 48 *sq.*  
 Carpenter, Dr., on Miracles and the Resurrection, 332  
 Carter, Mr. T. T.: *Present Movement a True Phase of Anglo-Catholic Church Principles*, &c., 259

## CAT

- Catacombs of Rome, Historical and Descriptive*, 218 *sq.*  
 Cathedrals and Church Music, 431-433  
 Celtic Church, the Early, 149-179; Mr. Skene's researches, 149 *sq.*; first Christian Church in Scotland, 150; Irish and Scotch paganism, 151 *sq.*; early Monasticism, 152, 155, 158 *sq.*; conversion of the Picts and Irish, 153; other missionaries to the Celts, 153 *sq.*; S. Patrick and his work, 155 *sq.*; S. Finnian, 158; second period of the Celtic Church, 159 *sq.*; Columbanus, 161 *sq.*; Columba and the monastery of Iona, 163 *sq.*; the Church of Northumbria, 170 *sq.*; the Easter controversy, 170 *sq.*, 175; eremitical clergy, 172 *sq.*; relaxation of the monastic rules, 176; Danish incursions, 177; extinction of the Celtic Church, 178  
 Cesnola, General, his work on Cyprus, 180, 185, 192 *sq.*  
 Charles I., evidence as to his authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 348 *sq.* See *Icon Basilikè* *passim*  
 Chesterfield, Lord, as Irish Viceroy, 107 *sq.*  
 Chichester, Bp. of, on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 457, 462  
 Christian position and that of its opponents, 304-334  
*Christian Year*, alteration of a line in the, 259 *sq.*  
 Chrysostom, S. John, on Matt. xvi. 18, 23; on Luke xxii. 31, 27  
 Church, Dean : *Human Life and its Conditions*, 231 *sq.*  
 Church Music, how can Cathedrals best further the culture of, 421-433  
 Church of England. See *Is the Church of England Protestant?*  
 Columba, S., 163 *sq.*; his death, 168  
 Columbanus, S., 161; his dispute with the Gaulish clergy, 162  
 Compton, Rev. Lord Alwyne, on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 457

## DWY

- Cosin, Bp., on the doctrine of the Real Presence, 300  
 Creeds and Theories of Development. See *Development*  
 Crichton, Rev. W. J.: *Srewell's Microscope of the New Testament*, 469  
 Cromwell, on the authorship of the *Icon Basilikè*, 337  
 Culdees, the, 175  
 Cuthbert, S., 172 *sq.*  
 Cyprian, S., cited, 18; on Luke xxii. 31, 19; on S. John xxi. 15, 20, 30  
 Cyprus, its history and resources, 179-198  
 Cyril, S., of Jerusalem, on the Petrine privilege, 31  
 Cyril, S., of Alexandria, on Matt. xvi. 18, 24; on John xxi. 15-17, 29  
 DENISON, Archdeacon: *Notes of my Life*, 226 *sq.*  
 Development, Creeds and Theories of, 123-149; evolution of creeds, 124 *sq.*; Roman theories of development, 126, 129 *sq.*; infallibility, 130 *sq.*; development as indicated by the facts of history, 132 *sq.*; creed-making ages, 134 *sq.*; early confessions of faith, 137; creed in the Apostolical Constitutions, 137, 138; growth of theology, 139 *sq.*, 147 *sq.*; the Apostles' Creed, 140; Arianism, 141; the course of Christian thought, 141 *sq.*; Dr. Schaff on the creeds, 142 *sq.*  
 Dixon, Mr. W. H.: *Royal Windsor*, 495  
 Doyle, Bishop, on mixed education in Ireland, 117  
 Drew, Rev. G. S.: *The Human Life of Christ revealing the order of the Universe*, 486  
 Drummond, H., a founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church, 36  
 Dugat G.: *Histoire des Philosophes et des Théologiens Musulmans*, 489  
 Dwyer, Canon: *The Diocese of Killaloe from the Reformation to the Close of the Eighteenth Century*, 492

## ECC

- ECCLESIASTICAL** Buildings  
Fire Insurance Bill, 1878,  
issues involved in the measure  
and the proposed establishment  
of Queen Anne's Bounty Board  
as an Ecclesiastical Fire Insu-  
rance Office, 442-465  
Epiphanius, S., on Matt. xvi. 18,  
21; on John xxi. 15-17, 28  
*Episcopal Letter and Reports of*  
*Committees*, 259  
Erasmus cited, 25  
Evans, Rev. A. B.: *The Future of*  
*the Human Race*, 511  
Ewer, Dr., his *Catholicity in its*  
*Relationship to Protestantism and*  
*Romanism* cited, 302 sq.

**FATHERS** (*The*), for *English*  
*Readers*, 258

- Fausset, Rev. A. R.: *The English-*  
*man's Critical and Expository*  
*Bible Cyclopaedia*, 467  
Finnian, S., 158  
Firmilian, S., on Pope Stephen, 18  
Froude, Mr., his *English in Ire-*  
*land*, 97 sq.; his historical state-  
ments compared with Mr.  
Lecky's, 98 sqq.  
Fuller, Rev. M.: *Our Established*  
*Church, its History, Philosophy,*  
*Advantages, and Claims*, 510  
Funk, Prof. F. X.: *Opera Patrum*  
*Apostolicorum*, 473

- GALLICAN CHURCH**, the  
present Position of the, 434-  
442; letter of Père Loyson to the  
Archbishop of Canterbury, 435  
sq.; reply from the Bishop of  
Moray and Ross, 436 sq.; im-  
portance of the subject, 441 sq.  
Gauden, Bp., his claim to the  
authorship of the *Icon Basilikè*,  
339 sq., 362 sq.; his letters, 340  
sq.; his wife's narrative, 343 sq.;  
his character, 368  
Gaudentius of Brescia, S., on John  
xxi. 15-17, 30  
Geikie, Dr. C.: *The English Re-*  
*formation, how it came about*  
*and why we should uphold it*,  
475

## ICO

- Gibbon, Mr. C.: *Life of Georg*  
*Combe*, 255 sq.  
Gibbs, Rev. M., his evidence in  
reference to the Ecclesiastical  
Buildings Fire Insurance Bill,  
454, 461 sq.  
Gidel, Ch.: *Nouvelles Etudes sur*  
*la Littérature Grecque Moderne*,  
488  
Green, Mr. J. R.: *History of the*  
*English People*, 246 sq.  
Gregory the Great, S., on Matt. xvi.  
18, 24, 25  
Gregory Nazianzen, S., on Matt.  
xvi. 18, 21; on John xxi. 15-17, 28

**HAGENBACH**, Dr. K. R.: *His-*  
*tory of the Reformation in*  
*Germany & Switzerland chiefly*,  
478

- Hall, Miss, her pretended gift of  
tongues, 46  
Hall, Dr. C. H.: *The Valley of the*  
*Shadow*, 512  
Hammond, H., on the Eucharistic  
Sacrifice, 300 sq.  
Hare, A. J. C.: *Life and Letters of*  
*Baroness Bunsen*, 505  
Hessey, Archdeacon, *Charge of*,  
259  
Hilary, S., of Poitiers, on Matt.  
xvi. 18, 20; on Luke xxii. 31, 27;  
on John xxi. 15-17, 30  
Hodgson, Rev. J. J.: *Memoir of*  
*Rev. F. Hodgson B.D.*, 501  
Hollingworth, Dr., on authorship of  
*Icon Basilikè*, 348  
Homer illustrated by the recent  
discoveries of Dr. Schliemann,  
392, 421  
*Homiletic Quarterly, The*, 510  
Hume, D., on authorship of *Icon*  
*Basilikè*, 365  
Huntington, Major, restores MS.  
of *Icon Basilikè* to Charles I.,  
358  
Hutton, Mr. R. H.: *Waller Scott*,  
257; his edition of the late Mr.  
Bagehot's *Library Studies*, 511

**ICON BASILIKÈ**, 334-369  
Ignatius, S., on Luke xxii. 31  
19

## ION

- Iona, monastery of, 164 *sq.*; its constitution, 165 *sq.*
- Ireland, discouragement of manufactures in, 103, 104 (*note*) *sqq.*; the Catholic question, 111; education, 113 *sqq.*; National schools, 115; Queen's Colleges, 118 *sqq.*
- Irvingism, the history and doctrines of, 34-65; origin of the 'Catholic Apostolic Church,' 35; E. Irving, 36; original leaders of the movement, 36, 46 *sq.*; claim to the title Catholic Apostolic, 37 *sq.*; summary of events, 39 (*note*); system of belief, 40; its pretensions examined, 42; the unknown tongues, *ib.*; evidence of witnesses, 43 *sq.*; prophets and apostles, 46 *sqq.*; non-fulfilment of the prophecies, 50 *sq.*; refractory apostles, 51 *sq.*; alleged miracles, 53 *sq.*; records of the 'Council of the Churches,' 55 *sq.*; protest of the Duke of Northumberland, 523
- Is the Church of England Protestant? 261-304; article in the *Quarterly Review*, 261 *sq.*; definition of the word Protestant, 263; phases of Protestantism, 264, 266 *sq.*; Church of England and German Lutheranism, 265 *sq.*; foreign policy of Elizabeth and her Ministers, 268 *sq.*; the Coronation Service, 270 *sq.*; Ordinations, 274 *sq.*, 278; Act of Uniformity, 277; Ordinal of 1552, 278 *sq.*; Episcopacy, 279 *sq.*; Continental Protestantism, 281; non-Episcopalian ministers and the Church of England, 282 *sq.*; the Church in the Channel Islands, 286 *sq.*; Abp. Bramhall, 288 *sq.*; intercourse between Church of England and foreign Protestant bodies, 289 *sq.*; the 'Sacrifice of the Mass,' 291 *sq.*; the American Church, 302; decay of English Protestantism as a religion, 303 *sq.*
- Isidore, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 23

JEFFREYS, Rev. Canon, his evidence on the Ecclesiastical

## LOY

- Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 1878, 457 *sq.*
- Jellet, J. H.: *The Efficacy of Prayer*, 483
- Jerome, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 21 *sq.*
- Jerusalem, prophecies concerning, 3 *sq.*
- Justin Martyr's *Memoirs of the Apostles and their Companions* cited, 322 *sq.*
- Juxon, Abp., on the authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 344

KALISCH, Dr.: *Bible Studies*, 235 *sq.*

- Keble, late Rev. J.: *Sermons for the Sundays after Trinity*, 232 *sq.*
- Kemble, F. A.; *Records of a Girlhood*, 508
- Kentigern, S. 168
- Klingkonstrom, Baron R. M.: *Le Comte de Fersen et la Cour de France*, 498

LAMBETH Conference, the, 517

Lancashire Cotton Strike, aspects and history of the struggle, 198-217

- Lang, Mr. R. H.: *Cyprus: its History, its present Resources and its future Prospects*, 180, 493
- Lashburn, Dr.: *The Social Law of God*, 512
- Latrie, M., his work on Cyprus, 180, 189, 192
- Lea, Rev. F. S., *Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of S. Katherine*, 256 *sq.*
- Lecky's History of England, 93-123
- Lee, Dr. F. G., *Historical Sketches of the Reformation*, 477; *Directorium Anglicanum*, 509
- Leo the Great, S., on Matt. xvi. 18, 24; on John xxi. 15-17, 31
- Levet, W., page to Charles I., his evidence on the authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 337, 360 *sq.*
- Lincoln, Bp. of: *Letter to Sir G. Prevost on Sisterhoods and Vows*, 259
- Loyson, Père, his petition to the Anglican Episcopate, 435 *sq.*

## MAC

- MACAULAY** charged with unfairness by Mr. Lecky, 103 (note)
- M'Neil, Dr.**, on the Irvingite gift of tongues, 47
- Macpherson, G.**: *Life of Anna Jameson*, 504
- Malan, Dr.**, on the first three centuries of the Church, 143
- Margaret, Queen of Scotland**, 178
- Martin, Rev. P.A.** *Nouveaux Mélanges d'Archéologie, d'Histoire et de Littérature sur le Moyen-Âge*, 248 sq.
- Martin, S.**, of Tours, 152
- Miller, Rev. E.**, on Irvingism, 38, 39, 41, 53 sq.
- Miller, Rev. W.**, *Village Homilies*, 511
- Milton**, his references to the *Icon Basilikè*, 336, 338
- Mony, M. S.**: *Etude sur le Travail*, 251 sq.
- Morison, Mr. J. C.**: *Gibbon*, 257
- Morley, Dr.**, Bp. of Winchester, on the authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 352
- Mozley, Dr.**, on the elimination of truth, 133 sq.

- NARES, Sir G. S.**: *Narrative of the Voyage to the Polar Sea in H.M. Ships 'Alert' and 'Discovery'*, 241 sq.
- Naseby, MS.** of the *Icon Basilikè* found at, 357 sq.
- Newman, Dr.**, on evolution of doctrine, 126, 128, 129
- Ninian, S.**, 152 sqq.
- Northcote, Rev. J. S.**: *Visit to the Roman Catacombs*, 218 sq.; *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, 223 sq.
- Northumberland**, protest of the Duke of, 523
- Norton, Rev. J. G.**: *Hearty Services*, 511

- ORIGEN** cited in reference to S. Peter as the Rock, 19; on John xxi. 15-17, 30
- Oxenham, Mr. H. N.**: his edition of *An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century*, 474

## REV

- PALMER, Major H. S.**: *Sinai from the Fourth Egyptian Dynasty to the Present Day*, 512
- Patrick, S.**, 154 sq.
- Peel, Sir R.**, establishes Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 118 sq.
- Perry, Canon G. G.**: *The Student's English Church History*, 479
- Petrine Claims**, Further Evidence on, 1-34; alleged primacy of the see of Rome, 2; Jewish seats of worship, *ib.*; prophecies concerning Jerusalem, 3 sq.; Scriptural passages concerning Rome, 5 sq.; absence of Scripture testimony, 9; other evidence investigated, 10 sq.; the Liturgies, 13 sqq.; the opinions of the Fathers, 16 sqq., 26 sqq.; their adversetests, 25; the Roman Missal and the Council of Trent, 26; epithets of S. Peter in ancient Christian writings, 32 sq.; failure of evidence, 34
- Philippi, Dr. F. A.**: *Commentary on S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 472
- Phillipotts, H.**, Bishop of Exeter, on the 'Protestant faith', 268
- Picinelli, Abate F.**: *Lumi riflessi della Sacra Scrittura*, 491
- Plummer, Mr.**, on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 459, 463
- Psalms**, the Titles of the, examined as to their genuineness as integral parts of Holy Scripture, 370-392
- Prendergast, Mr.**, on the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, 98
- RAMAGE, Dr. C. T.**: *Bible Echoes in Ancient Classics*, 491
- Retrospect of the year 1878**, 513; the late Bishop Selwyn, 514; the late Professor Mozley, *ib.*; the late Sir Gilbert Scott, 514; extension of the Episcopate, 516; the Lambeth Conference, 517; Colonial Missionary Churches, 519; Clergy Supply, 522
- Réveillaud, E.**: *La Question Religieuse et la Solution Protestante*, 486

## ROM

Rome, Scriptural references to, 5 sq.; Christianity in, in the fifth century, 6 sq.; identified with Babylon, 8  
 Royston, R., printer of the *Icon Basilikè*, 337, 338, 341

**S**ALES, S. Francis, of the Love of God, 258  
 Schaff, Dr., on the Apostles' Creed, 140; on the creed of Chalcedon, 142 sq.; on the Athanasian Creed, 143 sq.; on the subsequent Creeds, 145 sq.

Schliemann, Dr. See Homer.  
 Scott, Dean, Sermon by, 259  
 Scott, Mr. C. N.: *Foregleams of Christianity*, 233 sq.  
 Scott, the late Sir G., 514  
 Selwyn, the late Bp., 514  
 Shipley, Mr. O.: *Principles of the Faith in relation to Sin*, 480  
 Simpson, M. C. M.: *Nassau Senior's Conversations with M. Thiers, M. Guizot, and other distinguished Persons during the Second Empire*, 497  
 Skene, Mr., his *Celtic Scotland*, 149 sqq. See *Celtic Church*.  
 Skinner, Mr. C. E.: *The Guide of Life*, 258  
 Stephen, Mr. L.: *Samuel Johnson*, 257  
 Stephens, Rev. W. R. W.: *Life and Letters of Dean Hook*, 505  
 Story, *Memoirs of Rev. R.*, cited, 42 sq.  
*Supernatural in Nature, a Verification by free use of Science*, 229 sq.

**T**APLIN, Mr., Irvingite prophet, 47 sq.  
 Tertullian, on S. Peter as the Rock, 19  
 Theodoret, on Matt. xvi, 18, 24

## YOU

Thirlwall, Bp., on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 301  
 Thorold, Bp., his recent *Pastoral Letter to the Diocese of Rochester* cited, 303  
 Tomkinson, Mr., his evidence on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 458  
 Trevor, Rev. Canon, his evidence on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 455 sq., 461 sq.  
 Trollope, Mr. A.: *South Africa*, 236 sq.

**V**AUX, Rev. J. E.: *The Preacher's Storehouse*, 509  
 Velay, M.: *For Percival*, 505  
 Venables, Rev. G.: *Our Church and our Country*, 257  
 Violin, *The First*, 505  
 Voysey, Rev. C.: *Mystery of Pain, Death, and Sin*, 234 sq.

**W**ALFORD, Mr., on the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire Insurance Bill, 460, 462  
 Walker, Dr. A., on the authorship of *Icon Basilikè*, 346 sq.  
 Webb, Rev. W.: *England's Inheritance in her Church*, 510  
 Wills, Mr. E. F.: *Sacrificial Aspect of the Eucharist*, 259  
 Winchester, Bp. of: *Charge to his Diocese*, 259  
 Winslow, Rev. F. E.: *The Poor Man's Best Friend*, 511  
 Wordsworth, Dr. C. H. R., his collection of Tracts on the *Icon Basilikè*, 339 sq. See *Icon Basilikè* passim

**Y**ONGE, C. M.: *The Christians and Moors in Spain*, 511  
 Young, Arthur, on the discouragement of Irish manufactures, 104





XUM